THOMAS CRANMER AND THE EUCHARISTIC CONTROVERSY IN THE REFORMATION

Gordon Earl Pruett

A DISSERTATION
PRESENTED TO THE
FACULTY OF PRINCETON UNIVERSITY
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE
OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

RECOMMENDED FOR ACCEPTANCE BY THE
DEPARTMENT OF
Religion

May, 1968

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thanks is hereby expressed to my adviser, Dr. Horton Davies of Princeton, for his considerable help in the preparation and revision of this dissertation. Further gratitude is due Professor Terry Penner, especially for his well-considered and helpful criticisms of Appended Notes A and B. I would also like to thank Firestone Library, Princeton, New Jersey, for their cooperation in obtaining needed MSS from Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. Finally, I must acknowledge Dr. Barry White, of Regent's Park College, Oxford, as the source of my interest in the subject of this work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

I. THE EUCHARISTIC CONTROVERSY IN ENGLAND

The Conservatives 9

The Liberals and the Radicals 35

II. THE CONTINENTAL EUCHARISTIC CONTROVERSY

Luther and Zwingli 71

Calvin and Bullinger:
the *Consensus Tigurinus* 129

Bucer and Peter Martyr 195

III. THOMAS CRANMER ON THE PRESENCE OF CHRIST IN THE SUPPER 249

EXCURSUS 306

APPENDED NOTES

Appended Note A 316

Appended Note B 331

Appended Note C 352

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY 385

ABSTRACT 395

INTRODUCTION

The examination of the Eucharistic viewpoints of Continental and English Reformers which follows is predicated upon the fact of the centrality of the Eucharistic debate to the Reformation. The nature of the Eucharist came to be the dividing line not only between the Reformers and the Catholics, but also between the conservative and liberal-radical constellations within the Reformed camp.[1] It can be said that this issue of the Eucharist, specifically of the nature of the presence of Christ in the Supper, became possibly the most wide-spread subject of controversy on the Continent and in England. It certainly became the most bitter.[2] The pre-history of the Marburg Colloquy, as well as the history of this unsuccessful confrontation itself, indicate that controversy concerning the Eucharist was the first major schism of the new Protestant movement. Luther's uncompromising stand on the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Supper, which prevented him from recognizing Zwingli and his followers as allies in the strife with Rome, led inevitably to a serious division within the ranks. The course of the Reformation was thus seriously narrowed as a result of the failure of Marburg.[3] Indicative of the centrality of the controversy over the Eucharist is the fact that out of fifteen points proposed at the Colloquy for agreement, Luther, Zwingli and their followers disagreed on only one -- the question of the nature of the Eucharist.[4] Bucer's later attempts at concord ultimately failed, and the arbitrator of the Reformation fell into disrepute with both sides as a result of them. The breach between Luther and Zwingli was too deep.

---

[1] Cf. F. E. Hutchinson, Cranmer and the English Reformation (London: English Universities Press Ltd., 1951), pp. 11, 125.

[2] Cf. Hermann Sasse, This is My Body: Luther's Contention for the Real Presence in the Sacrament of the Altar (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1959), pp. 138-139, and Jaroslav Pelikan and Helmut T. Lehmann, gen. eds., Luther's Works, Vol. 37: Word and Sacrament III, ed. Robert H. Fischer (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1961), p. xi.

The implications of the split were not only theological, but political as well. In attempting to create a political force capable of withstanding the opposition of Charles V, Luther laid down terms for the entrance of the Swiss into a Protestant alliance. These were unacceptable to the latter; and although Luther needed all possible support from Reformed cities, he would not alter his terms to include the Swiss.[5]

---

[3] Harold J. Grimm, The Reformation Era (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1954), p. 197.

[4] Fritz Heidler, Christi Gegenwart Beim Abendmahl (2nd rev. ed.; Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, GMBH, 1949), p. 29.

[5] Hastings Eells, Martin Bucer (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1931), pp. 139, 140.

Thus not even the most pragmatic considerations could bring the two together, so deep was the rift.

By the time of the appearance of Calvin in the councils of Reformed Europe, the Eucharistic controversy was the scandal of Europe; and it would remain so for some time. Calvin showed his grave concern for the controversy in his *Petit Traité*:

> D'autant que la contention, laquelle a été trop aigrement débattue de notre temps a été malheureuse, comme le Diable, sans doute, l'a suscitée pour empêcher, voire même du tout rompre le cours de l'Evangile, je désirerais que le mémoire en fût du tout abolie.[6]

The centrality of the Eucharist in Calvin's thought-- a point cogently argued by McDonnell-- may perhaps be explained by his concern and dismay in the face of so much dissension and ill-feeling among the Reformers on this issue.[7]

Concern for the Eucharistic controversy was not, however, limited to the Continent or to the Luther-Zwingli debacle. Richard Cox, who proctored the Oxford Disputation on the Eucharist, in which Peter Martyr took prominent part in 1549, urged these considerations in his summary of the four-day debate:

I beseech you, both the aged and the young, by

---

[6] *Oeuvres de Jean Calvin*, Vol. II: *Trois Traités*, ed. Albert-Marie Schmidt (Paris: Editions "Je Sers", 1934), p. 137.

[7] Killian McDonnell, *John Calvin, the Church and the Eucharist* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1967), pp. 4, 74.

> the mercies of God, and as you value your salvation, that you would lay aside those controversies which, for many ages, have embroiled and distracted the church of Christ, about Transsubstantiation, and I know not what carnal presence. There is no end of such discussions. These are no other than the snares of the devil, in which he is perpetually entangling us, and holding us back from genuine piety.[8]

This matter drew attention from Martyr himself, who wrote to Bucer, "...there is so much contention among our people about the eucharist, that every corner is full of it."[9]

Martyr was not alone in his concern for the effects of controversy over the Eucharist. The Protectorate was keenly aware of these effects as they appeared on the Continent. The Protector was very likely persuaded to cooperate with Cranmer during the re-creation of the English Church for this reason. A solution on the matter of the Sacrament was essential to the establishment of a stable ecclesiastical system.[10] Indeed, the first act of the Parliament under Edward VI was directed against those who spoke irreverently of the Sacrament of the Altar. Furthermore, the question of the Eucharist was under popular as well as official discussion. Such phrases as "Jack-in-the-Box", "Round-robin", and that corruption of the dominical words, "Hocus Pocus", come from the period of the Protectorate.

---

[8] Charles W. Le Bas, The Life of Archbishop Cranmer (2 Vols.; New York: J. & J. Harper, 1833), II, pp. 24-25.

[9] F. M. Powicke, The Reformation in England (London: Oxford University Press, 1941), p. 84, and Original Letters Relative to the English Reformation, etc., ed. for the Parker Society by Hastings Robinson (2 Vol.; Cambridge, England: The University Press, 1847), II, p.469.

[10] Cf. A. P. Pollard, Thomas Cranmer and the English Reformation (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1906), p. 211, and Powicke, Reformation, p. 80.

A great deal was at stake. It is doubtless true that the denial of the miracle of the Mass, the transubstantiation of the substance of the bread and wine into the substance of the body of Christ, struck at the roots of the medieval ecclesiastical system; and for this reason, controversy regarding the nature of the Church took its most relevant form in the Eucharistic debate. It had been the claim of the medieval Church that the grace of God flows only through sacerdotal channels. Clerical privilege and clerical rule naturally ensued. Thus the Church in England indignantly asked Henry II, "Shall the hands that have made God be bound like those of a common malefactor?"[11] The Reformers denied that those hands could "make God". Cranmer asked:

> What availeth it to take away beads, pardons, pilgrimages, and such like popery, so long as the two chief rootes remain unpulled up: Whereof, so long as they remain, will spring again all former impediments of the Lord's harvest, and corruption of his flock.... The rest is but branches and leaves, the cutting away whereof is

---

[11] Pollard, Cranmer, pp. 244-245.

> but like topping and lopping a tree, cutting down of weeds, leaving the body standing and the roots in the ground; but the very body of the tree,... is the popish doctrine of transubstantiation, of the real presence of Christ's flesh and blood in the sacrament of the altar (as they call it), and of the sacrifice and oblation of Christ made by the priest for the salvation of the quick and the dead.[12]

Just what was at stake became clear when Mary Tudor assumed the throne of England. Justifiable questions about Foxe's estimates aside, a great number of people went to the fire for denying transubstantiation and the corporal presence. So far as Mary was concerned, this doctrine was the *sine qua non* of orthodoxy, for the question of authority appeared in its most tangible form in this matter. For the Reformers of England who lived for a time under Mary, this question was not a theoretical consideration for the University to debate. It was a question of life and death. To say that it was important is to understate the matter.[13]

---

[12] *Ibid.*, and cf. Philip Edgcumbe Hughes, *The Reformation in England* (3 Vols.; London: Hollis and Carter, 1954), II, pp. 84-85.

[13] Cf. Arthur Styron, *The Three Pelicans: Archbishop Cranmer and the Tudor Juggernaut* (New York: Harrison Smith and Robert Haas, 1932), p. 278; Philip Edgcumbe Hughes, *Theology of the English Reformers* (n.p.: Hodder and Stoughton, 1965), p. 219; Powicke, *Reformation*, p. 62; Arthur D. Innes, *Cranmer and the Reformation in England* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1900), p. 155; Charles Hastings Collette, *The Life, Times, and Writings of Thomas Cranmer, D.D.* (London: George Redway, 1887), p. 162; A.G. Dickens, *Thomas Cromwell and the English Reformation* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1959), p. 24.

Finally, the issue between the Romans and the Protestants was the extent to which it was believed that the Church of Rome had departed from the rule of Scripture. The Reformers felt that on the matter of the acquisition of merit generally, and the place of the Mass in this acquisition specifically, Rome had lost its right to be called the Vicar of Christ. The Eucharistic controversy in the Reformation made clear the depth and importance of the division between Reformer and Catholic. This is not surprising, in view of the centrality of the issue to both sides.[14]

It is intended here to present the Eucharistic teachings of major Continental and English Reformers. In so doing, the context of the debate and the positions taken up by the various constellations of Reformers will be set forth as clearly as possible. It is further intended to place the much-discussed Archbishop Cranmer within this context, with a view to clarifying what, as will be seen, is a troublesome problem in a very important discussion-- the position of Thomas Cranmer in the Reformation with respect to his Eucharistic doctrine.[15]

---

[14] Hughes, *Theology*, pp. 210,219; Le Bas, *Cranmer*, II, pp. 26-27; *Luther's Works*, Vol. 37, p. xvii; C. W. Dugmore, Review of *Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation*, by F. Clark, *Journal of Theological Studies*, N.S. Vol.XIV, Part I (April, 1963), p. 230.

[15] The reasons for the difficulty of this question are very well expressed by T. H. L. Parker: (1) vested ecclesiastical interests are at stake; (2) the english controversy has been isolated for too long from its continental counterpart; and (3) the question of the Eucharist has been "unrealistically isolated" from the "main body" of doctrine. J. Baillie, J.T. McMeill, H. P. Van Dusen, gen. eds., *Library of Christian Classics*,

The issue before us is, specifically, the Reformer's --and Cranmer's-- concepts of the presence of Christ in the Supper. It shall be the thrust of this work that Cranmer participates in the concept of the presence of Christ in the Supper which is to be found in the writings of Calvin, Bucer, Bullinger, and Martyr. It will further be argued that it is very likely that Cranmer's post-1546 writings are consistent with one another when they are read in light of this "Calvinist" concept of the Supper.

It will be further suggested that those who have in the past referred to Cranmer's "Zwinglian" concept of the presence have little justification for the use of this term. This, it will be shown, is due to the mistaken use of a label which is surely out of date by 1546. Finally, it will be concluded that the English Reformation owes much to the Continental in the former's formulation of its Eucharistic doctrine, as it appears in the works of Thomas Cranmer.

Vol. XXVI: English Reformers, ed. T. H. L. Parker (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1966), p. 289.

I. THE EUCHARISTIC CONTROVERSY IN ENGLAND

The Conservatives

In attempting to set forth clearly the context of the Eucharistic debate of the Reformation, it seems fitting to begin with the conservative position; and to begin with the conservative position in England. This starting point is elected not to assume the truth that the English Eucharistic debate precedes the Continental controversy either in temporal priority or depth of disagreement or subtlety of argument; but rather, because the focus of this work is the English Eucharistic debate, and Thomas Cranmer's part in it (though by no means to the exclusion of the Continental situation, as will soon be clear). We begin with the conservative position for the obvious reason that the Reformers themselves began with the conservative position, rebelling from or reforming it. It is therefore only reasonable to outline the conservative position in England at the outset.

At the beginning the intention is that this brief discussion of the conservative thought on the matter of the Eucharist, specifically on the question of the Real Presence and the implications thereof, is intended to outline conservative thought of the period in question. It is not intended to be a definitive study of Eucharistic theology in England, Henrician England, or Edwardian England. It is intended to present some understanding of the starting point from which the English Reformers, especially Cranmer, moved. Hopefully, such a discussion will illuminate the contrasts of the situation in which the debate occurred. I shall attempt such illumination by concentrating on the Eucharistic understanding of those English Catholics who maintained their conservative opinions throughout the Henrician and Edwardian periods. Special attention will be given to Stephen Gardiner's writings on the matter. His attitudes are generally indicative of the attitude of the conservatives toward the Reformers; but more important, Stephen Gardiner demonstrates best, of all the conservatives, the continuing allegiance to the Catholic teachings--and allegiance is the operative word in any discussion of the conservative position in Reformed England. He is as consistent in his understanding of the Real Presence and the effect of the words of Consecration as anyone has the right to expect from him. Thus, for an understanding of the conservative, Catholic attitude toward the Eucharist in our period, one ought to give Gardiner central position.

In the Henrician period as a whole, one sees evidence of some vacillation on the question of transubstantiation, and thus the corporal presence of Christ in the Supper. This is easily demonstrated by a brief comparison between the Ten Articles of

1536, and the Six Articles Act, "the whip with six strings" of the conservative back-lash of 1539. On the question of the Lord's Supper, the Ten Articles could be interpreted by both Lutherans and Catholics to their advantage. This is clear, though it has often been thought that the Ten Articles were constructed with a view to the conciliation of the Lutherans. However, the stamp of orthodoxy appears to have been upon the minds of the authors, for on the face of it, the Eucharist is defined in the orthodox fashion.[1]

The Ten Articles may well have been orthodox; but they pale into circumlocution when placed next to the first article of the Six Articles Act. This upheld Transubstantiation with some choler. The sanctions provided by the Six Articles Act are indeed fearsome, and none more so than the penalty for denying Transubstantiation. Should a man deny transubstantiation, he would suffer forfeiture of all his goods and chattels, and suffer death by burning. Abjuration of his heresy would not save him. There was no opportunity for recantation and safety. This penalty applied only to the first article.[2] Henry was by now (1539) fully committed to the course of Eucharistic orthodoxy; though he followed, aided and abetted by the efforts of his most valuable bureaucrat Thomas Cromwell, in the establishment of that other Reformation, the rebellion from political and jurisdictional controls of the Pope and the implications thereof.[3]

---

[1] A.G. Dickens, The English Reformation (London: B. T. Batsford Ltd., 1964), p. 175.

[2] *Ibid*., p. 177.

Orthodoxy on the matters of Transubstantiation and, thus, the Corporal Presence, were commanded by law, and upheld by the strongest sanctions of the law. The conservative positions on the matters of Transubstantiation and the Corporal Presence were thus considered the norm and not the heresy in this period of reform. What was this position?

So far as Transubstantiation was concerned, the decree of the Lateran Council of 1215, presided over by Pope Innocent III, remained the classic definition. It is not intended that a complete discussion of this decree or its implications appear here.[4] Rather, an introductory outline will suffice. It was held that at the speaking of the words of Consecration, the bread and wine became the body and blood of Christ. By the act of Consecration the priest could be said, simplistically, to have changed the material particles of bread into material particles of the flesh of Christ. The elements retained their appearance, or accidents, though in substance they were the body and blood of Christ, the same body and blood which were crucified on the cross. No change was apparent, but the change was considered to have occurred.

---

[3] I follow G. R. Elton in this interpretation, for which see, e.g. , Historical Association, London, General Series No. 51: Henry VIII: an Essay in Revision, by G. R. Elton (London: Published for the Historical Association by Routledge and K. Paul, 1962).

[4] For an extended discussion of the classical formulation according to Thomas Aquinas, see Appended Note A.

This teaching had its vulgar aspect, and its esoteric aspect. The adoration of the Host reflected the tendency to worship the elements as the actual body and blood of Christ. This attitude of reverence towards the elements reflected a popular belief in the presence of the body of Christ on the Altar. Abuses of the belief were common. The reservation of the Sacrament for purposes of performing quasi-magical deeds was noted by the Reformers.

As for the esoteric aspect, the corpus of philosophical argumentation in support of the contention for Transubstantiation and thus the Corporal Presence was voluminous. Briefly, a distinction was established between the accidents, or physical, empirically detectable qualities of things (here the elements) and their substance, or essentia. Size, color, form were considered accidents. Substance, however is without magnitude. Thus it was possible to discuss the existence of matter on two levels, the level of accident and the level of substance. Given this distinction, one could argue that change may and does occur at the level of substance without affecting the accidents. Further, since substance is unrestricted to spatial limitations, it may be present in more than one place. It is not limited to specific form. In this case, one may speak of change in a broad sense in the substance (here specifically locational change) which does not effect the accidents, nor which is governed by laws pertaining to accidents.

Such argumentation made possible the teaching that Christ's body, while said to be in heaven, ascending after the crucifixion, may be present on many Altars at the same time. Belief in the Real, Corporal presence (i.e. the body of Christ enclosed in the elements of the Supper) was thus shored up by philosophical argumentation. Adoration of the Host could, therefore, be considered a legitimate expression of worship of Christ himself, physically present.[5]

This was the teaching upheld, indeed commanded, by the Six Articles Act. In this respect Powicke notes that "...the Act did not imply reaction; rather it was a definition of heresy in matters which were under dispute. The bishops as a whole believed in the real presence, though they might differ about the interpretation of it."[6] What it was that the bishops did believe is our next concern.

Richard, Bishop of Chichester, played a part in the trial of Nicholson, alias John Lambert, in 1538. Lambert had submitted his reasons for his heretical position that Christ's body was not corporally present in the Sacrament, and these were debated, if the arraignment of one prisoner before the learned of the land could be called a debate.[7] Lambert's "sixth article" states, "Paul doth take it for a sore inconvenience, _deducere Christum ex alto_, Rho. 10. And yet must the Prestes do so, bringing his naturall body into the Sacrament: or elles they cannot bringe the same body into the Sacrament. Which I believe rather."

---

[5] Cf. Innes, Cranmer, pp. 114-115, where it is suggested that such argumentation could be understood only by the metaphysician and scholastic. Whether this be true or not, the effect of the argument, i.e. confirmation of belief in the Real Presence, added strength to the popular conception of the Eucharist.

[6] Powicke, Reformation, p. 69.

Chichester replied to the article:

> What christen man is so ignorant, that knoweth not this to be evidently true, that this most holy Sacrament hath not his Vertue of the Preste, which is a mortall man, and many tymes a sinner. For he is but a ministre, an a very instrument, by whom God worketh. Saint Chrysost. saith, _that the ministre is as it were the Penne, God is the hand._ The grace, the Vertue is of God.[8]

Chichester supports his arguments against Lambert with quotations from First and Second Corinthians, Augustine, the seventh chapter of Hebrews, and Eusebius.

---

[7] It might be said that both power and learning appeared at the trial in the person of the King himself; for on this very matter of the Sacraments, he had been granted the title _Fidei Defensor_, by Leo X for his _Assertio Septem Sacramentorum contra Martinum Lutherum_

[8] The exchange appears in John Strype, _Memorials of...Thomas Cranmer_ etc. (2 Vols.; "A New Edition, with Additions"; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1812), II, pp. 736-747.

He continues,

> We have the expresse words of Christ, *Hoc est corpus meum This is my bodye*. The wordes are plaine not only in Matthew, but the same playne wordes are in Luke and Mark, without any figurate speaking. Wherefore we may not add, diminishe, chaunge, or alter these wordes, that are so manifeste and playne; but certainly beleve these wordes to be true in the same sense, that they are clearly spoken, however they are impossible to mannes witte.[9]

As we shall see, the emphasis on the words of scripture provides the cornerstone for the conservative argument. But the words of scripture also provided a cornerstone for the Reformers. The question, it appears, is the vast one of scripture and/or authority, which is not to be resolved here. What is clear is that Chichester, and other conservatives with him, based their belief in the Corporal presence of Christ on the statement of scripture, This is my body. That this does not appear to be the case, i.e. that Christ's body is in the elements, is due to a failure on the part of "mannes witte", not of the truth of scripture.

Bishop Cuthbert Tunstall, surely one of the most attractive and learned figures of the conservative party, adhered to the same approach on the matter of the Corporal presence. However, he did object, in the end, to the emphasis on the means of the presence, transubstantiation. He told his great-nephew, Bernard Gilpin, that Innocent III had "greatly overseen" in pressing transubstantiation upon the Church. Here he was joined by Redmayne, the first master of Trinity College Cambridge. Redmayne never rejected the corporal presence. But he stated on his deathbed (1551) that he had studied the matter for twelve years, and found that some of the Fathers had written plainly contrary to the doctrine of transubstantiation, and that in others it was neither taught nor maintained.[10]

---

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 739.

The question of transubstantiation, therefore, begins to appear as that aspect of Catholic teaching which not only the Reformers, but the conservatives, appear to have questioned on grounds of reason, the Six Articles Act notwithstanding. Both Gardiner and Tunstall confessed that they could not say how the substance of the bread and wine was transmuted into the substance of the body and blood of Christ. Nevertheless, they remained loyal to the faith of the Church, accepting the doctrine of transubstantiation as true and necessary teaching. Their lack of minute explanation of means did not prevent them from viewing Cranmer's criticisms of received doctrine with the gravest concern, even alarm.[11]

The bishops seemed hesitant, not to say reluctant, to accept transubstantiation. On the other hand, their allegiance to the concept of the corporal presence was unflagging. While they could criticize scholastic conceptions of the process the end of which was the presence of the body and blood of Christ, they would not contend with the words of scripture which seemed to demand that presence. Thus their concern for the defection of Cranmer specifically and the Reformers generally from the belief in the Real Presence was considerable. They clearly regarded this heresy as the most serious; for it detracted from the truth of scripture, tradition, and the central place of the Mass.[12]

---

[10] Arthur James Mason, *Thomas Cranmer* (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1898), p. 127.

[11] Hutchinson, *Cranmer*, p. 129.

Burnet states that

> Tunstall had in all points given obedience to every law, and to all the injunctions that had been made [in the reign of Edward VI]: But had always in parliament protested against the changes in religion; which he thought he might with a good conscience submit to and obey, though he could not consent to them: only in the matter of the corporal presence he was still of the old persuasion, and wrote about it.[13]

The tome in question is Tunstall's *de Veritate Corporis et Sanguinis Domini in Eucharistia*, written while Tunstall was imprisoned in the Tower in 1551.[14] Dugmore states that in this work, "...he upheld the doctrine of transubstantiation, though he said some rather interesting things about it."[15] He did indeed. In fact, it would seem that in some sections of _de Veritate Corporis_ Tunstall was prepared to declare the matter something close to _adiophora_. The most learned of the ancients considered the manner in which the bread "passes into" the body of Christ inscrutable. "Before the time of Innocent III", says Tunstall, there had been a number of explanations as to the mode of the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the elements. Some had thought that it was present there as "Fire in a mass of iron"; while others contended that the bread ceased to exist. Innocent followed the explanation that "the substance of bread is transmuted into the substance of the body of Christ." Tunstall's opinion is that this view creates more problems than it solves, for "curious investigations" arise out of the difficulties of this teaching.[16]

---

[12] Cf. *ibid*., p. 125.

[13] Gilbert Burnet, *The History of the Reformation of the Church of England*, ed. and rev. by Nicholas Pocock (7 Vols.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1865), II, p.329

[14] Or possibly in his period of house arrest prior to moving to the Tower. Cf. C. W. Dugmore, *The Mass and the English Reformers* (London: Macmillan and Company Ltd., 1958), p. 152.

Tunstall then concludes that so long as one firmly believes that Christ is really,corporally present in the Supper, the question of how this comes to be ought to be left a matter of individual choice. Transubstantiation, then, on this argument cannot be called the _sine qua non_ of true Eucharistic belief, from Tunstall's point of view. While the Catholic world in general found transubstantiation rightly placed in the statements of Eucharistic belief, Tunstall, conservative on the question of the corporal presence though he was, was willing to leave the question open to the individual believer.

---

[15] _Ibid_., p. 152.

[16] _Ibid_..

Tunstall clearly and unequivocably asserts his belief in the corporal presence in this work. This belief, he affirms, has always been held by Catholics since the beginning, though different interpretations of the mode of Christ's presence were held down to the time of the Lateran Council. Though Tunstall was staunchly Catholic, he seriously questions the necessity of the Lateran definition. It appears to be very much a matter of opinion for him. Nevertheless, he will not reject the received teaching of the Church, neither on the question of transubstantiation, nor--certainly--on that of the corporal presence.[17]

An interesting letter written on 14 October, 1580, by his great-nephew Bernard Gilpin to his nephew Thomas Gelthrop may give further support to Tunstall's disapproval of the Lateran decision.[18]

Thus we have a pattern of affirmation of the corporal presence of Christ in the Supper, based for the most part on what was thought to be ancient tradition and scriptural words themselves; while on the other hand, the difficulties of transubstantiation are admitted. What of Stephen Gardiner?

---

[17] Cf. ibid. , p. 154.

[18] Ibid. Note that in this reference Dugmore seems to state Tunstall's negative attitude toward transubstantiation, thus perhaps releasing himself from the difficult implications of his assertion that Tunstall "upheld" transubstantiation,p. 152.

Gardiner's A Detection of the Devil's Sophistry, 1546, indicates that he, like Chichester, regarded "mannes witte" as an insufficient judge of the matter of the corporal presence. The giving of wisdom to every man for the asking is the root "of all false doctrine, and leads men to speak with 'presumptuous pride and intolerable arrogance,' especially with regard to the Sacrament of the Altar."[19] Thus the devil, to whom this tome is directed, leads men away "' captive and thralled from the true Catholic belief' by his appeal to the senses, which tell us that the bread and wine remain bread and wine after consecration."[20] But if we allow ourselves to rely on the senses for truth, how many of the true Christian doctrines will not be destroyed, and all Christendom lie in shambles? The Trinity, the Incarnation, and the Resurrection are all equally unbelievable to him who follows this path. Furthermore, why are these things more difficult than the breaking of the Host by the priest? "The breaking, as the moulding, affects only the form, the outward qualities, which remain those of bread and wine, not the substance of Christ's body. 'A mouse cannot devour God.'"[21]

---

[19] James Arthur Muller, Stephen Gardiner and the Tudor Reaction (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1926), p. 132.

[20] Ibid.

Dugmore warns us to beware of imputing to Gardiner a "gross belief in an carnal presence."[22] By this he means the belief that we actually eat and drink the bones, flesh, and blood of Christ. He cites a letter written to Somerset by Gardiner (1 May, 1547) in which he described Anne Askew as "blasphemously denying the presence of Christes natural body." Further, in other letters to Cranmer written during the summer of 1547, Gardiner argues that to affirm the doctrine, sola fides iustificat, is to deny the "presence of Christ's natural body really in the Sacrament." Further, "whoever had admitted the doctrine of 'only faith' in justification is compelled to reject the Sacrament of the Eucharist in the way we profess it."[23] Dugmore cites the reluctance of Ambrose and even Paschasius to affirm more than the "spiritual nature of the 'natural' body" present in the Sacrament, though they too affirm the Corporal presence. For this reason, it appears that we ought to resist the temptation to assign to carnal a belief in the Real presence to Gardiner. This argument is weak.[24] The possibility, not to say fact,[25] that Ambrose and Paschasius were thus hesitant does not force us to accept Dugmore's own reluctance to assign a carnal belief in the Real presence to Gardiner.

---

[21] Ibid.

[22] Dugmore, Mass, p. 185.

[23] Ibid.

[24] Dugmore's assertion of a "spiritual nature of the 'natural' body" is somewhat mystifying, ibid.

At the outset of Edward's reign, Gardiner affirmed the conservative, orthodox position characteristic of later Henrician England. He argued that to alter the religious settlement of 1543 was to invite disorder. The King's Book had asserted that the old doctrines concerning the Real presence, the Sacraments, and justification were truths to be maintained.[26] He went on to employ what was a characteristic argument for him:[27] " If the agreement in religion made in the time of our late sovereign lord [Henry VIII] be of no force in their judgment, what establishment could any new agreement have?"[28]

Two points can be made from the above letter: (1) the reference to the "old doctrine of the presence" must refer to the Real, ie. Corporal, presence of Christ in the Supper, that which was established teaching (and which probably derives from the Lateran Council of 1215, the last definitive statement on the Presence of Christ). Dugmore's qualification regarding a "carnal presence" seems unnecessary in this case; (2) Gardiner affirms here his commitment to the Henrician settlement, and further to the royal supremacy and its implications--all of which he helped to construct. That he should retract his work for Henry was unthinkable, as successive statements will show.

---

[25] Dugmore's thesis that the Reformed tradition in England on the matter of the Eucharist is endemic and domestic is questionable, and will be questioned. Cf. Thomas M. Parker, Review of The Mass and the English Reformers, by C. W. Dugmore, Journal of Theological Studies, N.S. Vol. XII, Part I (April, 1961).

[26] Hughes, Theology, p. 87; letter to Somerset, 21 May, 1547.

[27] Cf. Gardiner's de Vera Obedientia, 1535, passim.

[28] Hughes, Theology, p. 87.

Gardiner was commanded to preach before the King on St. Peter's Day, 1548. He was admonished by Somerset beforehand not to speak of matters in controversy. What Somerset referred to was probably the Sacrament of the Altar. But it was just this matter which Gardiner regarded as essential to the Christian faith as held by the Church. Given his activity in supporting the conservative position on this issue in the past, it was impossible that he should side-step it. It would have been, as Muller says, "an intolerable violation of his own conscience."[29] Thus on St. Peter's Day, 1548, he dwelt on the matter of the Sacrament. In the subsequent trial, when he was reminded that he had been told to avoid controversial matters, he replied, "I will preach, quoth I, the very presence of Christ's most precious body and blood in the Sacrament, which is the Catholic faith, and no doubtful matter, nor yet in controversy...."[30] Indeed, for Gardiner the matter of the Sacrament of the Altar, that is to say the matter of the corporal presence of the body and blood of Christ in the elements, was not a matter of controversy. It was the true teaching of the Church, and therefore not doubtful. In the sermon itself he affirmed that the Supper was indeed an occasion of remembrance of the sufficient sacrifice on the cross; "but that we might thoroughly remember his passion he instituted this Sacrament by his most holy word, saying, 'This is my body,' which word is sufficient to prove the Sacrament, and maketh sufficiently for the substance thereof...."[31] For Gardiner, the Real Presence is the true teaching, and not a matter of doubt.

---

[29] Muller, Gardiner, p. 177.

Further evidence for Gardiner's conservative stand, and thus for the position of the conservative party, may be found in Gardiner's reply to a work of the future Bishop of Gloucester and Worcester, John Hooper.[32] Hooper had denied the teaching of the ubiquity of Christ, whereby it was argued that Christ could be in many places at the same time. Thus Hooper attacked the Corporal Presence. Gardiner's reply was *A Discussion of Mr. Hooper's Oversight where he entreateth...the matter of the Sacrament.* 1550. Hooper had argued that since Christ's body was in heaven, as is plain from scripture, therefore it cannot be said to be present on the Altar. The belief in the corporal presence of Christ was based on the failure to see that the body of Christ was in heaven. Gardiner replied that since Christ was God, and with God nothing was impossible, "the question was not whether Christ's body could be in two places at once, but whether he willed it so to be."[33]

---

[30] *Ibid*. , p. 176. [31] *Ibid*., p. 179.

[32] The title of Hooper's work was *Hyperaspimus de vera Doctrina et Usu Coenae Domini*, in *Later Writings of Bishop Hooper*, ed. for the Parker Society by Charles Nevinson (Cambridge, England: The University Press, 1852).

Gardiner also noted that according to accepted Catholic teaching, the flesh received in the Sacrament was identical with the flesh of Christ's body in heaven, "which", he challenged Hooper, "if it profiteth nothing in the Sacrament...how shall it profit in heaven?" "And...why should Christ, after Mr. Hooper's doctrine ordain in his Supper a figure of that [which] profiteth nothing?" "If flesh profiteth nothing, how can the figure of flesh profit nothing?"[34]

Despite the continuing movement of the Edwardian Reformation toward a clearly "Reformed" definition of the Eucharist, i.e. towards a denial of the corporal, physical presence, Gardiner continued to mount attacks, from the Fleet prison for the most part, against what he understood to be a process of destruction of the truth of Catholic teaching and of the scriptures. In his *Explication and Assertion of the true Catholic Faith, touching the most blessed Sacrament of the Altar*, in reply to Cranmer's *Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament*, he argued that Christ's words in scripture were proof enough for the real presence. "This is my body" is and ought to be taken as literal truth by the faithful. Indeed, it has always been so. There is a miracle involved. If Christ is God (and who will deny it), then the miracle is not only possible but probable. The corporal presence transcends reason and nature. "Mannes Witte" is not the ultimate criterion for religious truth, as he often remarked. There is no obstacle here to the man of faith, who admits he cannot explain the mystery. "I know by faith Christ to be present, but the particularity how he is present, more than I am assured he is truly present, and therefore in substance present, I cannot tell...."[35]

---

[33] Muller, *Gardiner*, p. 205

[34] Cf. *ibid*. Note that Hooper's argument-- a favorite one with him--that "the flesh profiteth nothing" is also typical of the Zurichian theologians, Zwingli *and* Bullinger. Hooper spent years in Zürich, and one is not surprised to hear Zurichian phrases from him. This is one of the most distinctive.

While Gardiner may argue for the presence of the physical body of Christ in the Supper, he is not ignorant of the dangers of dividing the two natures. Christ and God are united at all times, as divinity and humanity were united in the Incarnation. Therefore after the Ascension, such unity still applied. However, St. Paul refers to the bodies of men at the time of resurrection in distinctive fashion. Following him, we cannot use the same terms to describe resurrection bodies and bodies as we know them. This applies also to the body of Christ in heaven. In the Sacrament, says Gardiner, we partake of this divine-human, glorified, spiritual body of Christ. But not of this body only; for "There is also understanded by concomitance to be present the substance of his soul, as very man, and also of the Godhead, as very God." Furthermore, "Flesh profiteth nothing in itself", but, "flesh in Christ is united to the divine nature", and is therefore "spirit and life" to the believing partaker.

---

[35] Muller, *Gardiner*, p. 210.

> As Christ is naturally in his Father, and his Father in him, so he that eateth verily the flesh of Christ, he is by nature in Christ, and Christ is naturally in him, and the worthy receiver hath life increased, augmented, and confirmed by the participation of the flesh of Christ.

"We eat not the carnal flesh of a common man, as the letter, but the very spiritual flesh of Christ, God and man, as faith teaching." " We receive Christ's flesh glorified, incorruptible, very spiritual, and in a spiritual manner delivered unto us."[36]

Gardiner's understanding of the physical presence must therefore be qualified by his concept of the unity of the two natures in the ascended body of Christ. Given this concept, he argues that to speak of receiving, eating, or participating in the flesh of Christ are not the same things as receiving, eating, or participating in the flesh a common human being. This subtle point, cleverly presented and strongly supported, is a necessary *caveat* to those who would class Gardiner with the simple belief in the presence of the human flesh of Christ in the Supper. On the other hand, it is also clear that we have here a doctrine of the corporal presence, one which is said to be based on scripture, and Catholic tradition. The subtlety of the argument is perhaps the high point of the conservative statement. He seems to score a point on Cranmer in the *Explication* when he deals specifically with Cranmer's concept of Christ's presence. He points out that while Cranmer deems the words "carnal" and "corporeal" too gross to be used of Christ's presence in the Sacrament, he does not hesitate to use them of Christ's presence in heaven. "Really, carnally, and corporeally he is only in heaven", says Cranmer. Gardiner notes,

---

[36] *Ibid.*, pp. 210-211.

> In such a sense as this author useth the terms carnal and corporeal against the Sacrament to imply a grossness, he cannot so attribute those terms to Christ's body in heaven.[37]

Indeed, Cranmer cannot do so without some injustice to (a) the ascension of Christ as the Pauline model for the resurrection body, and (b) the divine-human nature of Christ.

Despite the strength of this argument, Gardiner does appear either to contradict himself, or perhaps slip inadvertently into more realist terminology.

---

[37] *Ibid*.

In one place he affirms "the body that suffered,... the body of very flesh", is that which is present in the Sacrament. In another he states, "we receive not in the Sacrament Christ's flesh as it was crucified... but Christ's flesh glorified, incorruptible and impassable, a godly and spiritual flesh."[38] Apparently this is another reference to the argument for a profoundly changed body of Christ extant after the Ascension. Both statements must be admitted in evidence as Gardiner's, are both indicative of his stand, though they appear contradictory.

Gardiner criticizes Cranmer, in his Explication, for taking all the mystery out of the Sacrament of the Altar. It is "a jolly easy way without any mystery or marvel at all." But he agreed with Cranmer on the matter of spiritual feeding. It is "a good teaching and wholesome exhortation."[39] He admits that to identify the spiritual feeding of which Cranmer speaks with eating of Christ's body does admit of confusion. In so saying he also admits his belief in a distinct difference between the two. The Real Presence, for Gardiner, could mean the spiritual body--but it certainly meant the body of Christ, in whatever form it took. Muller states that "Since Christ's body in the Sacrament is substantial as well as spiritual, it is ... [for Gardiner] actually present, not figuratively, nor in the heart of the believer only, and is received by good men and evil, worthy and unworthy."[40]

---

[38] *Ibid.* [39] *Ibid.*, p. 212. [40] *Ibid.*, pp. 211-212.

In summing up Gardiner's position,[41] we should deal with Muller's interesting suggestion that whereas Cranmer began with transubstantiation and passed to a denial of any corporal presence, Gardiner reversed that order.[42] Gardiner affirmed that reason would substantiate the claim that if it be the body of Christ in the Sacrament of the Altar, the substance of the bread cannot be there. "For in the rule of common reason the grant of one substance is the denial of another." "...in everything all is substance and accidents; but the accidents be not changed, and yet, a change there is; it must needs be then that substance is changed" "It must needs be true, that if the body of Christ be really in the Sacrament, there is of necessity transubstantiation also."[43] But although this is clear to reason, it is not clear to the senses. The senses are untrustworthy on the matter of substance in any instance; for substance "as it is truly in learning understanded" is " an inward, invisible, and not palpable nature, but only perceived by understanding."[44]

---

[41] Innes, Cranmer, is reluctant to give Gardiner his due:"Gardiner affirmed the Presence to be called into the bread and wine by the act of consecration, but failed to provide any intelligible account of what he meant by that Presence." p. 134. This seems a hasty and clearly inadequate judgment of what we have seen to be a careful argument for the Real Presence. That there are statements which do not mesh does not make the account unintelligible. Innes suggests that "to less subtle intellects" it appears that one can only differentiate Cranmer's and Gardiner's opinions on the Corporal Presence by saying "that on Gardiner's the elements become themselves an object of worship by consecration, and on Cranmer's they do not." Ibid. This seems overly simplistic. It certainly does not do justice to the subtlety of Gardiner's intellect, no mean thing.

[42] Muller, Gardiner, pp. 212-213. [43] Ibid.

How can we bring these statements, affirming transubstantiation, into line with other statements of Gardiner?[45] What in fact has Gardiner affirmed in the statements just preceding? He has affirmed that the substance of the body of Christ is in the Sacrament. The substance of the bread is not. If this is true, then there must exist the means whereby such action occurred. The means is transubstantiation. Gardiner admits transubstantiation. He does not claim to understand or have an explanation for the means, i.e. transubstantiation. I suggest that he affirms transubstantiation without affirming its mechanics. He can say on the one hand, that "there is of necessity transubstantiation", while on the other admit that he cannot understand how the body of Christ comes to be in the Supper. This is a description of acceptance of doctrine on the one hand, and the admission of ignorance regarding the mechanics of the doctrine on the other. Given this, I see no difficulty in both statements arising from the same man. Indeed, there appears to be no difficulty in applying this description to the conservative party in general. That reason cannot explain how the substance of Christ's body comes to be in the elements is not there-

---

[44] *Ibid*.

[45] Cf. above, p. 17.

therefore cause, from the conservative viewpoint, for the rejection of transubstantiation. Indeed, one may, with Redmayne, find either no references or adverse references to transubstantiation in the Fathers, and still admit transubstantiation. I submit that such ratiocination was characteristic of the conservative party.

Finally, we must note that Cranmer himself appears on the list of conservatives in his early career.[46] Two interesting comments are made by Cranmer in his annotations on the King's Book[47] of 1543. Regarding the use of a phrase "to consecrate sacraments", Cranmer remarks: "consecracion is called onely of the sacrament of the aulter, therefore it is more playne to say thus, to consecrate the body of Christ [,] to mynyster the sacraments".[48] Again, with regard to the phrase "Wordes belongyng to the consecracion", Cranmer reminds the writer, " we say not the wordes of the consecracion of any of the sacraments savyng onely of the sacrament of the alter."[49] The most probable deduction from these statements is that Cranmer believes in the unique link of the act of consecration with the Eucharist. That he would use the term "consecracion" at this time in any but the orthodox sense is difficult both to accept and to prove. Further, though it is possible that at this point Cranmer was studying the problem of the Real presence, insofar as is possible to determine he was still orthodox in his handling of Barber's case in 1541.[50] It seems likely that Cranmer is in 1543 publicly a conservative.

---

[46] This will be discussed at length in a later part.

[47] Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, Parker MSS, 104.

[48] Ibid, p. [254].

[49] Ibid. , p. [256]

The conservatives of Reformed England maintained the corporal presence of Christ in the elements. They further admitted a transubstantiation in the Eucharist, though with varying degrees of doubt. Their allegiance to Eucharistic doctrine which they held to be firmly founded in the Church and in the Scriptures was for the most part unfaltering. When we turn to the liberals and the radicals of the Reformed group in England, we find considerable contrast.

---

[50] On which see the treatment of the development of Cranmer's doctrine below.

The Liberals and the Radicals

For reasons indicated above, we are unable to draw an adequate outline of the liberal and radical standpoint on the matter of the Real Presence[1] until we reach the period of Edward VI, a period of reform which leaves Henrician England well behind. At first the authority of the King and Council dictated a policy of caution. Even after the death of Henry, the crown was to be assumed by a nine-year old boy, Edward VI. It did not require outstanding political acumen to see that the matters of reform would lie in the hands of the regency council provided for in Henry's will. In fact, however, the reforming phase was not only to continue under Somerset, but also to wax and strengthen. In this atmosphere, the liberal and radical arguments against the Real Presence and its implications flourished.

Hughes points to the general concept of the

---

[1] "Real" here is meant to indicate the problem of what was believed, not to solve that problem.

Reformers in England regarding the Eucharist as it appears in various pages of the Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum.[2] While closely associated with Cranmer, this work exhibits a clearly Reformed outlook. Its attitude toward the Eucharist is enlightening. The Eucharist is the Sacrament in which bread and wine are received at the holy table of the Lord. What is communicated is, with the bread and wine, the grace of the Holy Spirit and the forgiveness of sins. Forgiveness is obtained because by faith the recipients take hold of and receive the very body and blood of Christ which was crucified, according to the promises of God the Father.[3]

These signs then bring the faithful to confess how Christ is nourishing them and remains with them. The faithful also learn the source of their communion, since all are members of the one body of Christ. There is no need for transubstantiation--an ingenious invention of man. Indeed, this doctrine is said to conflict with the teaching of the human nature of Christ, with scripture, and with the accepted teaching of the nature of the Sacraments.[4]

We see the following characteristic emphases of the liberal and radical groups: (1) opposition to transubstantiation and the corporal presence based on a typical repugnance to purely human tradition, on divine scripture, and on the general nature of the Sacraments as the signs and not the things signified; (2) the action of the Holy Spirit;[5] (3) the communion of the faithful as shored up and strengthened by participation in the Supper; (4) the memorial of Christ's death and resurrection; (5) the power of the elements as signs to elicit from the faithful remembrance of Christ's work, and consequent confession and forgiveness of sins.

---

[2] Hughes, Reformation, II, p. 125.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid.

A further section emphasizes that Christ is not limited to the Sacraments, and that it is through the moving of the mind to recall the work of Christ that participation in Christ is effected. Those who have received the sentence of death, and who are thus unable to participate in the Lord's Supper

> should be diligently instructed by some pious man that Christ is not restricted to the sacrament, but that from Him the authority and force of the Sacrament derives: wherefore if to Him they lift up their minds, and with a faith that is fixed and unmoved direct their minds to His death, they have eaten the body of Christ and drunk his blood.[6]

How we ought to identify this doctrine is not of great concern at this point (as we have yet to consult the various possibilities). Innes, however, suggests that after 1548 it was Calvinism which actually dominated the theology of the English Reformers.[7] The emphasis noted here on the action of the Holy Spirit may indicate that this is true (though the matter will be held in abeyance until we have dealt with Calvin). Hutchinson suggests that from the same period continuing especially to 1552 it is "Swiss influence" with which we are dealing.[8] Hopf is rebuked[9] by Rupp for not giving "sufficient weight to the presence of indigenous Sacramentarian opinion in England (very much more than the 'Swiss' Party was involved)." The matter appears to be, thus far, one for controversy. I do not intend to resolve this strife in this chapter. Rather, I suggest that we consider the position of the radical and liberal Reformers as they see it, and postpone the label-pasting ceremony.[10]

---

[5] A matter we shall discuss with special reference to Calvin. But note that it is by the action of the Holy Spirit that the participants receive the fruit of the Supper.

[6] Hughes, Reformation, II, p. 125. Note here a typical expression of Calvin's teaching, that of the lifting up of the hearts to Christ in participation with him and in him in the Supper. Cf. his Form of Church Prayers, in Bard Thompson, Liturgies of the Western Church (Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, 1961), p.207.

Since it is obvious that public statements of a liberal or radical nature on the Eucharist appear well before 1547, we ought to begin before 1547. John Frith, it is said, was the first Englishman after Wycliffe who opposed the received doctrine of Transub-

---

[7] Innes, Cranmer, pp. 125-126.

[8] Hutchinson, Cranmer, p. 128.

[9] Gordon Rupp, Review of Martin Bucer and the English Reformation, by Constantin Hopf, Journal of Theological Studies, Vol. XLVIII (1947), p. 118.

[10] I use the terms "radical" and "liberal" for two reasons: (1) to be able to speak of the non-conservatives as a general group; (2) to be able to allow for such differences as exist between, e.g. Knox and Cranmer.

transubstantiation.[11] At his 1532 examination, Frith upheld the refreshing and enlightened opinion that he was willing to leave the matter of the Real Presence of Christ in the Supper as a thing indifferent, "till the matter might be reasoned, in peace and at leisure, of both parties."[12] It was for this attitude toward both Transubstantiation and the corporal presence[13] that he was consequently burned. Burnet (and Foxe) notes the substance of his argument. Christ in the Sacrament gave eternal life. But the receiving of the bare Sacrament did not give eternal life. Christ's presence there was only felt by faith, and did not occur through physical means. The fathers before Christ

> did eat the same spiritual food, and drink of the Rock, which was Christ, according to St. Paul. Since then, they and we communicate in the same thing, and it was certain that they did not eat Christ's flesh corporally, but fed by faith on a Messias to come, as Christians do on a Messias already come. Therefore we now do only communicate by faith.[14]

Frith also argued for the Sacrament of the Altar as mystical signs of Christ's body and blood: "...for if they were truly the flesh and blood of Christ, they should not be sacraments."[15] Thus a Sacrament has three ends. These are the following: (1) by "visible action" to knit into one body the followers of Christ; (2) to convey grace to those who truly receive the Sacraments; (3) to "stir up" remembrance of the work of Christ on man's behalf. The corporal presence contributes nothing to these ends.[16] But Frith, says Burnet, drew no further conclusion from his arguments other than that the corporal presence was not a necessary article to our faith. Nonetheless, here is Reformed, if early Reformed, doctrine.

---

[11] Collette, Cranmer, p. 169.

[12] Le Bas, Cranmer, II, p. 47.

[13] I should explain that "Real Presence" will indicate general belief in a presence of Christ, while "Corporal Presence" will indicate that one concept of the presence, the inclusion of the body and blood of Christ in the elements. Given this distinction, "Real" need not necessarily mean "Corporal" presence. Obviously, I mean to distinguish between the two.

[14] Burnet, Reformation, I, pp. 273ff.

Next, we ought to note Lambert's position. We have already remarked on Lambert's sixth article at his trial in 1538.[17] Lambert had been challenged on his doctrine of the Eucharist by Wolsey eight years before and had managed to satisfy the Archbishop on the question of his orthodoxy. In 1538 he was not so successful. The usual learned disputants were joined by Henry himself at the trial. The King came to the point: is the body of Christ present in the elements? Lambert denied this. The King argued by referring to the dominical words, Hoc est corpus meum; and then commanded the Archbishop to confute Lambert's statements. But Lambert affirmed that Christ was still in heaven. Even St. Paul, on the road to Damascus, "heared a voice, and saw a vision, but not the very body of Christ."[18] We have here what was to become another stock Reformed argument against the corporal presence. If Christ ascended into heaven, how can it be said that he shall be on earth, when the Creed and scripture promise that he remains at the right hand of God, from whence he shall come to judge the living and the dead? The trial ended predictably.

---

[15] Ibid. [16] Ibid.

[17] See above, p. 15.

The foundation of Lambert's argument was Christ's bodily ascension into heaven: "And as he is no more corporally in the world, so can I not see how he can be corporally in the sacrament, of his holy supper."[19] Lambert did admit a presence of Christ in the Supper, but a spiritual, not a corporal one.

> Thus, O most gracious and godly prince! do I confess and acknowledge, that the bread of the sacrament is truly Christ's body, and the wine to be truly his blood, according to the words of institution of the same sacrament: but in a certain wise, that is to wit, figuratively, sacramentally, or significatively,.... But by the same can I not find the natural body of our Saviour to be there naturally, but rather absent... from the sacrament....[20]

Of the Reformers who influenced substantially the course of the Edwardian movement toward Reformed Eucharistic teaching, the great preacher (if not great theologian) was Hugh Latimer. Strype tells us "It was but seven years before his burning that he

---

[18] Burnet, Reformation, II, p. 403.

[19] Dugmore, Mass, p. 179.

[20] Ibid. , p. 181.

[Latimer] relinquished that old error [corporal presence] that is about the year 1547, as he confessed to Dr. Weston in his disputation."[21] Burnet speaks of Latimer as sharing a Lutheran opinion with Cranmer as early as the trial of Lambert, 1538.[22]

Latimer appears to have believed in a spiritual eating, and to have rejected the corporal presence. Christ our Saviour, he argued, offered himself at the last supper. It was intended that we should gain great comfort from this supper; and thus he explained how the Supper should be received. Those who eat and drink the elements worthily receive "the very body and soul of Christ spiritually." Briefly, "whosoever believeth in Christ, putteth his hope, trust, and confidence in Him, he eateth and drinketh Him: for the spiritual eating is the right eating to everlasting life."[23] Again we note emphases which will be seen to be characteristic of the liberal-radical English group. The rejection of the corporal eating is implicit. Note also the affirmation of the spiritual eating, and the belief in Christ which is everlasting life.

One of Thomas Cranmer's chaplains, Thomas Becon, provides another indication of the liberal-radical position. In his Catechism, Becon suggests several reasons for the institution of the Sacraments. They were first of all testimonies, pledges, signs or seals "of God's grace, favour, and mercy, to teach us that God is merciful unto us, and will forgive our sins, justify, and save us for Christ's sake."[24] His third reason for the institution is that the Sacraments "should be signs, tokens, and marks of our confession." Fourthly, they are "bonds and sinews" which bring and hold together the congregation of God "publicly and openely." Sixthly, "they should be testimonials unto us, to testify and witness how nigh Christ joins Himself unto us, that He giveth Himself whole unto us, and that He will dwell in us and endow us with all his benefits and riches." The emphasis on the spiritual participation in Christ, in terms of the community and in terms of faith is clear here. Seventhly, the Sacraments are pledges of God's good will toward us. He "hath commanded us to use them for our comfort."

---

[21] Strype, *Memorials*, I, p. 97.

[22] Burnet, *Reformation*, I, p. 402. Taylor took Lambert's "Ten Articles" to Cranmer, "who was at that time also of Luther's opinion, which he had drunk in from his friend Osiander. Latimer was of the same belief." Dugmore relates the conflict between Latimer and Wolsey on the matter of the former's Lutheranism, *Mass*, pp. 93-94.

[23] Hughes, *Theology*, pp. 209-210.

The appearance of the Book of Common Prayer of 1549 was not greeted with unanimous approval. Revolt flared in Devon and Cornwall, based on wide-spread opposition in those areas to the new service book. Nicholas Udall (as well as Cranmer) replied to the demands of the Commoners of Devonshire and Cornwall. Their fourth demand was this: "Item, we shall have the sacrament hang over the high altar and there to be worshipped as it was wont to be, and they which will not thereton consent we will have them die like heretics against the holy Catholic faith."[25] Udall replied to this demand by stating flatly,

---

[24] These passages are from Hughes, Theology, pp. 199-200.

> ye shall understand that because the Communion is a spiritual receiving, which consisteth in the spiritual participation of the sacrament, of Christ's most blessed body and bloude to be received of the Christian congregation in the remembrance of Christ's death suffered for the redemption of mankind and for the remission of our sins.

The said Sacrament gives spiritual benefits only; for the flesh profits nothing, the spirit gives life. Therefore, the Sacrament of the body shall be no more reserved than the Sacrament of the blood is.[26]

Udall's reply shows clearly the emphasis on the spiritual reception of Christ, and the rejection of the corporal presence (therefore the rejection of transubstantiation and the efficacy of the reserved Sacrament) which the liberal-radical group made the core of their argument in the Eucharistic debate. In 1549 this is the official counter-argument to conservative (in the Commoners' case reactionary) positions. We have encountered both positive and negative approaches from the liberal-radical group. The development of the precise meaning of the spiritual participation was a matter to be discussed for many years. Positive suggestions as to the implications of the belief in the spiritual participation were far fewer than condemnations of the corporal presence and transubstantiation. The matter which appears to have been foremost in the minds of the Reformers was their concern for the perversion of true doctrine by the Roman Church, by human tradition, and by the neglect of scripture. They dwelt on this point ad nauseam. The question of the replacement for the corporal presence and transubstantiation was longer in being answered. The suggestions were already appearing, in terms of the emphasis on signs, symbol and spiritual presence, the emphasis on faith, the efficacy of the Holy Spirit. On the whole, however, the question was one of the best means of defeating once and for all the proponents of transubstantiation. John Bradford, who shared his prison with Latimer and Ridley, writes in this fashion. He commented on the reason for his imprisonment and his understanding of the charge against him. The chief thing against him was his denial of the Sacrament of the Altar, which he said was not the Supper of the Lord but a human perversion of it by the priests. He denied that Christ was corporally enclosed in the elements, and that the substance of Christ came to be present in the elements by transubstantiation. In his opinion, the true Supper--as well as the crucifixion and resurrection--had been made of no account and falsified by the Roman Church.[27]

---

[25] Troubles Connected with the Prayer Book of 1549, ed. Nicholas Pocock (London: Printed for the Camden Society, 1884), N.S. Vol. 37, p.154. We shall consider Cranmer's reply elsewhere.

[26] *Ibid.*, p. 155.

---

[27] Hughes, Theology, p. 219.

But Bradford went on to suggest his own conception of the true belief.

> In the supper of our Lord...I confess and believe that there is a true and very presence of whole Christ, God and man, to the faith of the receiver ...as there is a very true presence of bread and wine in the senses of him that is a partaker thereof.[28]

As with other Reformers, there is no question of rejecting the presence of Christ in the Supper altogether. Rather, the corporal presence, a perversion of the true teaching, is to be rejected because it is a delusion and trap, derived from man and not God.[29]

During the Edwardian Reformation, liberal and radical opinions rendered in England were by no means limited to Englishmen. The arrival of many eminent foreign divines, for the most part fleeing the consequences of the Interim and the defeat of the Schmalkaldic League, made England a veritable market of doctrine and controversy. Bucer, Peter Martyr, Fagius, A' Lasco, Micronius, Ochino, Poullain, and others contributed to the formation of the English Church. Martin Bucer and Peter Martyr will provide special interest in a further section.[30]

---

[28] *Ibid*.

[29] The question before us, as it will be throughout this work, is what is meant by the presence if it is not corporal? The solution lies only in a comprehensive examination of Reformed positions.

[30] Joseph C. Mclelland, *The Visible Words of God* (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1957), p. 37, notes: "The influence of the Continental Reformers upon Cranmer and the Churchmen whose friendship with Peter Martyr was so close is undeniable, but to call it undesirable

For examples of the thought of these divines on the question of the Real presence, we note the writings of Micronius and John A' Lasco.

A' Lasco arrived in England in the autumn of 1548 from Friesland. The son of a Polish squire, he was a close friend of Erasmus. While living at Emden he had held the post of superintendant of the Reformed Churches of Friesland until his move across the Channel. In 1550 he was appointed leader of the "Strangers' Church" in the Diocese of London.[31]

Dalton[32] notes that A' Lasco viewed the Eucharist as a mystery which can be understood by attention to the signs. But the Eucharist is not a mere sign. Rather, we are joined to Christ in the Eucharist, though there is no suggestion of the eating of the corporal body of Christ. The effect of the Sacrament, nevertheless, is to bind the body of Christ (i.e. the communio, the church) to the body of Christ which is

---

or 'foreign' is to miss the point that this influence was deliberately sought and cultivated by the first and second generations of English Reformers." We shall have occasion to discuss the first statement elsewhere.

[31] Ridley, then Bishop of London, strongly opposed the presence of this foreign body, for A' Lasco's congregations were allowed the use of their own forms of service. Cranmer himself had given permission for this departure from the Act of Uniformity of 1549, probably because of his long acquaintance with continental divines and the presence of many of them in the country at the time. Cf. Dickens, Reformation, pp. 232, 247: Jasper Ridley, Nicholas Ridley: A Biography (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1957), pp. 232ff.

[32] Hermann Dalton, Johannes a Lasco (Gotha: Friedrich Andreas Berthes, 1881), pp. 352-354.

in heaven. Further, the eating binds the members of the communio to each other. He suggests that the purpose of the Sacraments in general is twofold: (1) there is first a binding of men to the body and blood of Christ; (2) there is then a renewing of the spirit and of the conscience.

A'Lasco rejected a belief in the physical presence. He felt that this erroneous concept was derived from a misunderstanding of the words of consecration. "Corpus", in this instance, did not mean the substance of Christ, but the communio corporis Christi, i.e. the church. Participation in the Sacrament is therefore not participation in the flesh of Christ, but rather in the church.[33] A' Lasco's definition of the Supper might be expressed thus: the Supper is a presentation of Christ in the reception of elements, through which reception we are signed as members of one body and blood, until he comes. The Supper is also an occasion of humility and realization of our brotherhood in Christ, through his work for us. It reminds us of our responsibilities to one another as members of the congregation of Christ.[34]

A' Lasco thus draws not only a non-corporal teaching of the presence of Christ into his understanding of the Eucharist, but also notes clearly the ethical and social implications of participation in the body of Christ. He stood with Zwingli and Carlstadt against the teaching of ubiquity, transubstantiation, and the local presence in the elements. But his emphasis on the presence of Christ, and his refusal to make the Supper consist in bare signs is interesting. Hein[35] opposes the common placing of A' Lasco in the Zwinglian camp. It is true that Zwingli shared A' Lasco's concern for the effect of the Sacrament as binding the members of the communio closer together. During the controversy with Luther, however (culminating in the Colloquy at Marburg), this emphasis receded into the background in favor of the strong opposition to Luther's belief in the real presence. Zwingli died in 1531. Thus at his death it can be said that he appeared to believe the Supper to consist in bare signs.[36] Whether he would have altered the appearance of his argument had he lived is, of course, a moot point. Thus Hein is correct, though perhaps for inevitable reasons, that A' Lasco and Zwingli did not fully agree in their idea of the presence of Christ in the Supper.

---

[33] Karl Hein, " Die Sakramentslehre des Johannes a Lasco" (submitted for degree of Licentiat, Rheinischen Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität, Bonn, 1904), p. 38. Hein comments: "so kommt Lasky beim Abendmahl, wie auch bei der Taufe,--analog dem Charakter der Ecclesia als einer Gemeinschaft von Gleidern eines Leibes--auf sittliche Ermahnungen, wie Nachfolge Christ, Frömmigkeit, usw.", p. 39.

[34] Ibid., p. 40.

Further, it appears that A' Lasco did not come over to Reformed doctrine on the Supper until after Reading Calvin's Institutes in 1544. Hein argues that he moved into the Calvin-Bucer camp on this issue.[37] A' Lasco, by 1545, is no Zwinglian, but a Calvinist. He insisted that the promise and the elements were joined together, thus exhibiting a linking of Christ and believer in the elements which one can find in Calvin. Finally, the Calvinistic emphasis on the _Sursum Corda_ as the model of participation in the Supper is also to be found in A' Lasco.[38] Whether or not A' Lasco's spiritual father really is Calvin is not our concern at the moment. Rather, we are interested in seeing A' Lasco's place in the liberal-radical tradition in England.[39]

---

[35] Ibid., pp. 46ff. "Some, like a Lasco, held the thoroughgoing Zwinglian view, which saw in the Eucharist nothing but a sign." Francis Clark, Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation (Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1960), p. 118. Clark does, however, refer to "Zwinglian as Bullinger held."

[36] An extended discussion of this appears below.

A' Lasco, however, does not appear to accept the label of Zwinglian with ease. Indeed, though Dugmore carelessly refers to "the Zwinglian A' Lasco",[40] the situation requires rather more careful analysis and qualification. What was Zwinglianism in 1547, with Zwingli dead and Bullinger in charge since 1531? Dalton notes that A' Lasco received a copy of the _Consensus Tigurinus_ "with joy" from Bullinger, and apparently agreed wholeheartedly with its conclusions. Whether or not one wishes to assign great or little influence to the _Consensus Tigurinus_ at the time of its composition, surely the point must be noted that to pass off A' Lasco as "the Zwinglian A' Lasco" at a stroke is hardly in keeping with the complexities of the situation.

---

[37] Hein, "a Lasco", pp. 52ff. [38] _Ibid_., p. 97.

[39] The question of his influence on Cranmer belongs in our section on Cranmer himself. But see Dalton, _a Lasco_, C. H. Smyth, _Cranmer and the English Reformation under Edward VI_ (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1926), Dugmore, _Mass_, for discussions of the issue.

[40] Dugmore, _Mass_, p. 127.

Micronius, an associate of A' Lasco, deserves a place in this survey of the liberal and radical school. From the Catechism of Micronius, the date of which is given as December 8, 1550, we note that the question of whether or not Christ's body and blood are "necessarily present" on earth, and thus in the elements is asked. The reply is a strong no; for if this is so the sacrifice of the cross is rendered null and void. Further, such a belief is contrary to the opinions of the Fathers. It also contradicts the teaching in the Creed of the ascension of Christ into heaven. Finally, this teaching is unkown to the prophets and the apostles.[41]

Micronius suggests instead that the profit of the Sacrament is that in "lively" fasion it is set forth that "Christ hath once for all upon the cross made an everlasting full and perfect oblation and sacrifice for...sins", and that forgiveness is obtained through believing in him. This full trust in everlasting life through the work of Christ is made a sure belief

> as verily, truly and certainly as I at his table eat of the bread broken and drink of the cuppe of the Lord, which (after the use of holy scripture and manner of Sacraments) he called his body and blood.[42]

We turn again to English liberals and radicals.

---

[41] Pocock, Troubles, p. xliii. [42] Ibid., pp. xli-xlii.

John Hooper spent the years 1547-1549 in Zürich, where he became a close friend of Bullinger. His continued correspondence after his return to Engl[illegible] bears out the debts of friendship and doctrine he owes to the leader of the Zürich Church. The question of the Lord's Supper is no exception. Such indebtedness is evident in his *Hyperaspimus de vera Doctrina et Usu Coeni Domini*. Hooper affirms

> Christus verba sanctificationis circa panem et vinum efferendo panis et vini substantiam ita, in Sacramentum corporis et sanguinis sui consecravit, ut memoria essent et recordatio corporis sui immolati et sanguinis sui super crucem in remissionem peccatorem effusi.[43]

Besides this emphasis on the memorial aspect of the Supper, it will be clear that Hooper could abide no doctrine of the corporal presence.

> It is well known that he [Christ] proposed to institute a Sacrament; therefore he speaks of a Sacrament sacramentally. To speak sacramentally is to give the name of the thing to the sign; so yet not withstanding, that the nature and substance of the sign remaineth, and is turned into the thing it signifieth.[44]

Such an argument upheld the elements as the sign of the thing signified, i.e. the body of Christ. The corporal presence in the sense of the inclusion of Christ's body in the elements was an unacceptable teaching on Hooper's concept of the Sacraments alone. He also denies such a presence in the Supper on the basis of belief in Christ's presence in heaven.

---

[43] Hooper, *Later Writings*, p. 413

[44] *Early Writings of John Hooper*, ed. for the Parker Society by Samuel Carr (Cambridge, England: the University Press), p. 76. Cf. Hughes, *Theology*, p. 198.

His opponents affirm the presence of the corporal body of Christ in the Supper. Hooper believes and confesses a spiritual and sacramental presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Supper; for the corporal body of Christ is present at the right hand of the Father, whence he shall come to judge the living and the dead.[45]

Hooper does affirm the reception of Christ in the Supper

> but spiritually, through a true and lively faith; that is to say, the body and blood of Christ are not given to the mouth and belly for nourishing of the body, but unto our faith for the nourishing of the spirit and inward man unto eternal life.[46]

For this reason Christ need not descend to earth in order for us to participate in him. Rather, we ascend to him, "lifting up our hearts through a lively faith on high unto the right hand of the Father where Christ sitteth, from whence we wait for our redemption."[47]

This is not to say, however, that the Sacraments are merely signs. Hooper states clearly

> I put as much difference between the sacraments

---

[45] Hooper, Later Writings, p. 443. For a much longer affirmation of Christ's presence in heaven, and thus his corporal absence from the elements of the Supper, cf. Ibid., pp. 479ff.

[46] Hughes, Theology, pp. 215-216

[47] Ibid., p.

> of Christ, and all other signs and tokens not appointed for sacraments, as I do between the seal of a prince, that is annexed unto the writing or charter that containeth all the prince's right and title that he hath unto his realm, and the king's arms painted in a glass window.[48]

The power of the Holy Spirit must be taken into account here. The thrust of this simile appears to be this: while the arms of the prince painted on a window does elicit memory of the prince, his seal affixed to an official document actually transmits virtue and power to that document and its contents. The Sacraments are, for Hooper, of this latter category.

> But when the minister delivereth unto me the thing that is in his power to deliver, to say, the bread and wine, rehearsing the words of Christ's institution, the Holy Ghost delivereth unto my faith, which is mounted and ascended into heaven, the precious body and blood of my Saviour Jesus Christ spiritually, and not corporally. So doth the merits of this precious body in heaven feed my poor wretched soul upon the earth.[49]

How, we may ask, is this possible? Hooper affirms that it is no "contradiction or impossibility" for Christ's body to give himself to the communicant. For an action similar to that of affixing the seal of the prince to the document--making the promise good, so to speak--takes place in the reception of the Sacrament, according to Hooper. He states that it is the work of the Holy Spirit which provides the fulfillment of the promises. The body

---

[48] Hooper, Early Writings, p. 191.

[49] Ibid.

> may be in heaven, and yet extend his virtue by the operation of the Holy Ghost into my soul, by the means of faith, which at the time of the receiving of this sacrament is in my soul, and out of my soul: as the Spirit of God is in every godly heart, and out of the heart in heaven with God: who was God, at the creation of man unto his own likeness, in man and out of man.

Hooper, gratefully, sums up his argument with a favorite simile of the Reformation, the sun and its rays.

> Yet,... as the sun in heaven doth extend down his beams and lighten the earth, so doth Christ's body by faith, in spirit, expulse all darkness and sin out of the heart; moveth not bodily but is everywhere, where faith is, spiritually, and at one time....[50]

It is the power of the Holy Spirit which makes possible communication of Christ in the Supper, that is, the communication of the "virtue" of Christ.[51] As with

---

[50] *Ibid*., pp. 191-192.

[51] Note also from the *Hyperaspismus*: Verba quibus utitur Spiritus Sanctus, et quibus Dei sacramenta fiunt, adhibent atque asciscunt res terrestres panem et vinum in sacrum usum et finem ex mandato Dei et Christi institutione, et corporis et sanguinis Christi nomine creaturas panis et vini induunt: ut jam non sit communis panis et commune vinum; sed ut per mandata Dei et Christi institutionem sacramenta corporis et sanguinis Christi sint mysteria nostrae redemptionis in illius corpore super crucem morte sua nobis perquisitae.... Poculo benedicere est vinum virtute Spiritus Sancti et Christi institutione per verbum Dei consecrare in sacramentum sanguinis Jesu Christi: ita ut vinum ejus substantiam cujus est sacramentum. *Later Writings*, pp. 407 ff. Hooper thus affirms the presence in the Supper of the body and

A' Lasco, it cannot be said of Hooper that he held the Supper to be mere signs: there is for him a communication of the power of Christ in the Supper, and thus a communication of Christ himself.

Further, the signs are "signs of reconciliation and great atonement made between God and us through Jesus Christ."[52] The Sacraments are not "void and empty signs, but full; that is to say, they are not only signs whereby something is signified, but else they are such signs as do exhibit and give the thing that they do signify indeed."[53]

Hooper condemned the Prayer Book of 1549 in very strong terms, for reasons best left to our discussion of that Prayer Book.[54] Not satisfied with the revision of 1552, he joined the blower of the trumpet against the "Monstrous Regiment of Women", the dour Knox, in denouncing the rubric calling for the reception of communion in the kneeling posture. Knox delivered a terrifying warning to the young King at the end of September, 1552, while the Prayer Book was actually at press. The receiving of holy communion, Knox preached, while kneeling was nothing short of idolatry, for it was worshipping the

---

blood of Christ by action of the Holy Spirit. He can thus affirm an objective presence without capitulating to those who uphold transubstantiation.

[52] Hughes, Theology, p. 195. [53] Ibid.

[54] Note also Hutchinson, Cranmer, p. 121, where Hooper is said to have been described as "an opponent of Lutherans and Bucerians", an opinion acceptable as on the whole true, but needing qualification in light of the following discussion of Bucer below.

elements. It might be thought by some that Christ was corporally, carnally present in the Supper. The King, shaking, demanded that something be done. The result was the "black rubric", the erratum slip inserted in some of the newly-printed copies to the effect that the communicants ought not to think that they were receiving the body of Christ corporally, nor that they were participating in an act of adoration of the host.[55] Cranmer actually got Knox to submit and back down from his towering rage; but the rubric appeared nonetheless.[56]

Knox thus occupies the position of a latecomer to the liberal-radical camp, though his entrance does not go unnoticed. He was, with Hooper, responsible for the "last stone piled on the cairn below which lay the ancient belief about the Holy Eucharist", i.e. the Corporal Presence.[57]

The Reformer which attracts most attention for our purposes is Nicholas Ridley. It is Ridley's statement that he was brought to his own Reformed doctrine of the Supper through reading the treatise of Ratramnus which appears to have given Dugmore the strongest point in his case for the domestic source of the Anglican Eucharistic doctrine.[58] Barclay goes so far as to claim that Calvin's doctrine is that of Ratramnus, and that Calvin's doctrine is also that of the English Church.[59] Reply and analysis must be postponed for the moment, for we have other elements to consider. That Ridley is a crucial figure in the English Reformation is, however, indisputable. Therefore we must spend some time with him.

---

[55] Hughes, Reformation, II, p. 124

[56] Cf. Powicke, Reformation, pp. 91-92.

[57] Hughes, Reformation, II, p. 124. Note McLelland's suggestive summary of the significance of the "black rubric", namely that it is not indicative of a "Swiss" view of the Supper, nor does it indicate "a low doctrine of the sacraments." Visible Words, p. 37.

It is not intended to produce here a biography of Ridley.[60] Rather, we shall begin with the years 1540-1547. It is likely that during this period Ridley was converted to the Reformed doctrine of the Lord's Supper, and denied the doctrine of transubstantiation. At this time he held a living at Herne, and apparently spent much time in study while there.[61]

He states that after reading Bertram of Corbie[62] he was impressed by the arguments and decided that he had misinterpreted the Fathers.[63] He was impressed, suggests J. Ridley, not because the arguments themselves were so well-founded, but because Bertram had written what would in Ridley's time have been an heretical tract, and lived, in the ninth century. The situation, he thought, had worsened considerably.[64]

---

[58] See Dugmore, Mass, pp. 128ff., 246, et passim.

[59] Alexander Barclay, The Protestant Doctrine of the Lord's Supper: A Study in the Eucharistic Teaching of Luther, Zwingli and Calvin (Glasgow: Jackson, Wylie & Co., 1927), pp. 285ff.

[60] For which see, J. Ridley, Biography.

[61] The source of this suggestion, notes Jasper Ridley, is a sentence in Ridley's Last Farewell: "Wherefore, farewell Herne.... And yet I must acknowledge me to be thy debtor for the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, which at that time, I acknowledge, God had not revealed unto me." The Works of Nicholas Ridley, ed. for the Parker Society by Henry Christmas (Cambridge, England: the University Press, 1841), p. 407.

[62] Ratramnus

[63] Ridley, Works, p. 206

Though Ridley had probably consulted with Cranmer in 1546, in his sermon given at St. Paul's in December 1547 he seems to have been reluctant to commit himself openly. He inveighed against those who would vilify the Mass. Blasphemers of the Mass, he said, were worse than the devil. Those who opposed the Mass should leave the church while it was being administered. The flesh and blood of Christ were present in the Supper: it was, therefore, a holy meal, not to be reviled.[65] Whether or not Ridley actually affirmed the corporal presence of Christ in the Supper is not clear from a reading of this sermon. But his hearers undoubtedly thought Ridley referred to the corporal presence.

To help in the formulation of a clear statement on the Lord's Supper, a ten-point questionnaire was drawn up by Cranmer and sent to the bishops in

---

[64] J. Ridley, *Biography*, pp. 94ff. Ridley, convinced of the falsity of transubstantiation and the corporal presence, conveyed his conclusions to Cranmer. Cf. Innes, *Cranmer*, p. 131, Burnet, *Reformation*, II, p. 197, Le Bas, *Carnmer*, I, p. 254. This matter, viewed from Cranmer's standpoint, will receive extensive treatment in Appended Note C.

[65] Cf. J. Ridley, *Biography*, p. 137.

1547.[66] Ridley's replies indicated that he had decided to make his views public, though not in detail. With the exception of one answer,[67] Ridley appears to have joined the Reformed contingent. He affirms that the oblation and sacrifice of Christ in the Mass is so entitled merely "because it is a representation and memorial of his cross and passion; and nothing can be essential to the mass but what is set forth respecting it in Scripture."[68]

We turn now to a more detailed discussion of Ridley's position. In his *Brief Declaration of the Lord's Supper...against the Error of Transubstantiation*,[69] he declares:

> I do plainly affirm and say that...[this] I am persuaded to be the very true meaning and sense of God's holy word; that is, that the natural substance of bread and wine is the true material substance of the holy sacrament of the blessed body and blood of our Saviour Christ.[70]

It cannot be denied that this is realist terminology; for Ridley appears to confess that the "material substance" of Christ's body is the substance of the bread. Further, he derives this conclusion from Scripture.

This statement is to be read, it seems, with some other such as that of his *Last Examination before the Commission*,[71] where he argues for the partial truth and partial falsity of the first article of examination--that he had denied the real and natural presence of Christ in the Supper after Consecration.[72]

---

[66] Gregory Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (2nd. ed; London: A. & C. Black, 1945), pp. 640ff.

[67] Le Bas, *Cranmer*, I, p. 243: "Nevertheless, as concerning the part that pertaineth to consecration, Dionysius and Basil move me to think it no inconvenience that part should be spoken in silence."

[68] *Ibid.*, pp. 243-244.

[69] Ridley, *Works*, pp. 1ff.

[70] *Ibid.*, p. 15.

> In a sense the first article is true, and in a sense it is false; for if you take *really* for *vere*, for spiritually, by grace and efficacy, then it is true that the natural body and blood of Christ is in the sacrament *vere et realiter*, indeed and really; but if you take these terms so grossly, that you would conclude thereby a natural body having motion to be contained under the forms of bread and wine, *vere et realiter*, then really is not the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament, no more than the Holy Ghost is in the element of water in our baptism.[73]

Ridley's redist terminology is made possible because of his belief that the body and blood of Christ are present in the Supper and received by the faithful. Replying to Ward in his disputation at Oxford, he argues

> For [Christ] bade them take his body sacramentally in material bread: and after that sort it was both bread which he bade them take, because the substance was bread, and that it was also his body, because it was the sacrament of his body, for the sanctifying and the coming of the Holy Ghost which is always assistant to those mysteries which were instituted of Christ, and lawfully administered.[74]

Later, replying to Weston, he says, quoting Theophylact,

> "I grant", quoth he, " the bread to be converted and turned into the flesh of Christ; but not by

---

[71] *Ibid*., pp. 253ff.

[72] *Ibid*., p. 271.

[73] *Ibid*., p. 273.

[74] *Ibid*., p. 228.

> sacramental converting or turning." It is transformed, saith Theophylact in the same place, "by a mystical benediction, and by the accession of coming of the Holy Ghost unto the flesh of Christ." He saith not, by expulsion or driving away the substituting or putting in its place the corporal substance of Christ's flesh.[75]

It is the work of the Spirit which gives an objective character to the presence of Christ.

Much of the Reformers' discussion regarding the presence of Christ in the Supper is centered on the significance of the "_est_" in the phrase " _Hoc est corpus meum_". Ridley's opinion took on the Reformed appearance. In the _Declaration_, he argues that one must understand the words of Christ in the Supper "by a figure called metonymy". The "_est_" of the words of institution cannot bring about transubstantiation, nor was it ever meant to. The Sacrament of the Supper was instituted by figurative words; and those who argue that Christ used no figures of speech strain the meaning of the words out of all proportion.[76] The emphasis on figurative speech will be evident throughout the liberal-radical school.

The presence of Christ in the Supper corporally is rendered untenable, in Ridley's argument, by the credal and scriptural truth that Christ is in heaven. In the disputation at Oxford[77] he insists that the carnal presence

> varieth from the articles of faith: "He ascended

---

[75] _Ibid_., pp. 229-230.

[76] _Ibid_., p. 20.

[77] _Ibid_., pp. 185ff.

> into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father, from whence (and not from any other place, saith St. Augustine), he shall come to judge both the quick and the dead." It destroyeth and taketh away the institution of the Lord's Supper, which was commanded only to be used and continued until the Lord himself should come. If, therefore, he be now really present in the body of his flesh, then must the supper cease: for a remembrance is not of a thing present, but of a thing past and absent. And there is a difference between remembrance and presence.[78]

Rather than an emphasis on the carnal presence, based on the supposed need for participation in Christ, the spiritual presence and the spiritual participation are not only true to the intentions of Christ himself, but also the real sources of the efficacy of the Supper.

> I say and confess with the evangelist Luke, and with the Apostle Paul, that the bread on the which thanks are given, is the body of Christ in remembrance of him and his death, to be set forth perpetually of the faithful until his coming.
>
> I say and confess, the bread which we break to be the communion and partaking of Christ's body, with the ancient and the faithful fathers I say and believe, that there is not only a signification of Christ's body set forth by the sacrament, but also that therewith is given to the godly and faithful the grace of Christ's body, that is, the food of life and immortality.[79]

To this opinion Ridley was led by Bertram of Corbie, who "pulled him by the ear" to the Reformed understanding of the presence of Christ.[80]

---

[78] _Ibid_., p. 199.

[79] _Ibid_., p. 201.

[80] _Ibid_., p. 206.

According to Bertram (Ratramnus), there is a twofold meaning to the presence. There is first the verity, and second the mystery. Every Sacrament has both verity and mystery. The verity is in the bread and wine, the mystery in the body and blood of Christ. The verity refreshes the body and also signifies (i.e. is a figure of) Christ's body, crucified for our redemption, and Christ's mystical body, the Church, by way of pledge and image. The mystery of the Sacrament feeds the soul invisibly, and is taken in faith, not by the senses.

Ratramnus objects to the presence of Christ in the mass corporaliter, for this leaves no room for faith, or for the mystery of the Sacrament. Therefore Christ must be present in the elements spiritualiter.[81] This distinction is present in Ridley, as we can see. Speaking against Smith in the disputation, Ridley asserts that

> of Christ's real presence there may be a double understanding. If you take the real presence of Christ according to the real and corporal substance which he took of the Virgin, that presence being in heaven cannot be on earth also. But if you mean a real presence, "secundum rem aliquam quae ad corpus Christi pertinet", i.e. according to something that appertaineth to Christ's body, certes [sic] the ascension and abiding in heaven are no let at all to that presence. Wherefore Christ's body, after that sort, is here present to us in the Lord's Supper.[82]

---

[81] Cf. Dugmore, Mass, pp. 27ff.

[82] Ridley, Works, p. 213.

Against Watson, he notes the conception which will eliminate the difficulty, a concept very close to that of Bertram.

> I understand that place of the very flesh of Christ to be eaten, but spiritually: and furthur I say, that the sacrament also pertaineth unto the spiritual manducation: for without the spirit to eat the sacrament is to eat it unprofitably.[83]

The spiritual eating is the profitable eating, while the carnal understanding (as with Bertram) really destroys the true meaning of the Sacrament.

Ridley summed up his position against transubstantiation and the corporal presence in the Cambridge Debate of 1549. Transubstantiation was opposed to scripture, for the fruit of the vine is wine, he asserted, not blood. It is also in conflict with the ancient Fathers. Thirdly, the doctrine of transubstantiation destroyed the nature of the Sacrament. This, he stated, consisted in unity, nutrition and conversion.[84] The bread, which symbolized Christ, brought, in reception, these three benefits. But transubstantiation made such benefits inaccessible. Fourth, transubstantiation denied the truth of the human nature of Christ, and made those who accepted it Monophysites. Finally, Christ had ascended to the right hand of the Father. He could not therefore be corporally on earth.[85]

---

[83] _Ibid_., p. 238.

[84] Conversion does not refer to any substantial change in the elements, as _per_ transubstantiation. Rather, Ridley appears to mean a sacramental change from common status to specially employed symbol, i.e. a "sacramental mutation" such as we shall see in Peter Martyr and Cranmer.

Ridley's noteworthy Treatise on the Lord's Supper admirably supplements these conclusions. He posits five questions to be answered: (1) is the mass a sacrifice? (2) is Christ corporally present in the Supper? (3) ought one to worship the host? (4) does transubstantiation occur through Consecration? (5) does a sinner receive the body and blood of Christ? The answer to all the questions depended on the answer to the second one. If Christ is corporally in the Supper, then the other questions are to be answered positively. If the body and blood were present, transubstantiation must have occurred, the bread and wine ought to be adored, a thief or murderer would receive the body and blood of Christ by accepting the elements, and the offering up of the substance of the body and blood in the elements would constitute a sacrifice. Ridley declared, however, that the corporal body and blood of Christ were not present in the Sacrament, as we have seen. The implications are the reverse from those of a positive reply.[86]

---

[85] J. Ridley, Biography, pp. 179-180. Clarke, Sacrifice, p. 165, says of the Debate, "yet in his Determination concluding the debate he firmly rejected any doctrine of a real objective presence of Christ in the Eucharist."

[86] J. Ridley, Biography, pp. 96-98. H.C. Porter, Review of Thomas Cranmer, by J. Ridley, Journal of Theological Studies, N.S. Vol. XIV, Part II (Oct., 1963), suggests that understanding of the theology of the Prayer Books might be found in the Declaration, rather than with Cranmer, p. 540.

Ridley's position is thus firmly opposed to that of the conservatives on the matter of the carnal presence. On the other hand, it cannot be denied that there is a very strong idea of the presence of Christ in the Supper throughout his writings. We have noted his belief in the action of the Holy Spirit, which accomplishes the presence of Christ. Ridley never denies a true presence. Bertram's concept of the importance of the presence is evident, an importance that was actually undermined, not supported, by the teaching of transubstantiation and of the presence of Christ corporaliter. We will note that Calvin objected to transubstantiation and the carnal presence for much the same reasons. We will note also that he, like Ridley, used realist terminology, and gave a dominant role to the action of the Holy Spirit in the participation in Christ.[87]

Ridley was made Bishop of London in 1550, and thus embarked on the most spectacular stage of his career, his session with the altars of London and the vestments of Hooper. While this matter does not impinge directly on the question at hand, it indicates two things about Ridley: (1) he would not allow the Mass to continue as a sacrifice. This follows from the teachings of his we have already examined. The altars, the symbol of sacrifice best known to Londoners, had to go. He carried out the implications of the beliefs stated in the *Treatise* in practical terms, demonstrating his willingness to join his fellow scholar Cranmer in the matter of Reforming *activity*, not just Reforming *thought*. Ridley felt the necessity to make the change from altar to table quite strongly.

---

[87] Ct. Clarke's discussion of the English Reformers' beliefs regarding the Real Presence, i.e. they "denied any real objective presence of Christ in or with the Eucharistic elements." Sacrifice, pp. 159ff. In light of our understanding of those beliefs, this opinion is untenable.

> The form of a table...shall more move the simple from the superstitious opinions of the popish mass unto the right use of the Lord's supper. For the use of an altar is to make sacrifice upon it; the use of a table is to serve for men to eat upon. Now, when we come unto the Lord's board, what do we come for? to sacrifice Christ again and to crucify Him again? or to feed upon Him that was once crucified and offered up for us? If we come to feed upon Him, spiritually to eat His body and spiritually to drink His blood (which is the true use of the Lord's supper), then no man can deny but the form of a table is more meet for the Lord's board than the form of an altar....[88]

(2) His opposition to Hooper's obstinate rebellion against the wearing of vestments in his new capacity as bishop indicates the conservative side of his nature. Jasper Ridley suggests that his ancestor,[89] though he considered vestments as *adiaphora*, feared the lapse into disorder of the Anabaptist variety which Hooper showed in his reliance on his private judgment. It is the younger Ridley's contention that both Cranmer and Ridley feared private judgment, extremism, and

---

[88] Hughes, *Theology*, p. 221.

[89] J. Ridley, *Biography*, pp. 200-232.

Anabaptists more than all "Papistry"--for the latter was at least orderly, if corrupt. While interesting, this suggestion claims too much for itself. Rather, the precipitate action of Hooper at this juncture would naturally upset what was already a situation threatening to move too fast for the leaders of reform, and too slowly for Hooper and Knox.[90] Ridley would naturally attempt to dissuade Hooper, and he did, though unsuccessfully. He argued that even though the vestments had nothing to do with salvation, and were not compulsory as such, the question of their use ought to be referred to the Christian State, i.e. to the primates, for decision. Once the decision was made, the question should be regarded as settled. Hooper did not agree.[91]

Summing up briefly the liberal-radical position, the Reformers unanimously concurred in a rejection of any but a spiritual eating of Christ in the Supper. The worthy recipient received Christ in his heart, not in his mouth. The Sacrament is a visible word of the promise of God. The Book of Common Prayer of 1552 thus gives these words to be said at the time of distribution: "Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on him in thy heart with thanksgiving."[92] The presence of Christ in the Supper is a spiritual presence, but nevertheless a real presence to him who receives with faith. It is an inner, not merely an external, presence.

---

[90] Hooper seems to have rubbed up almost everyone the wrong way.

[91] J. Ridley, Biography, pp. 200-232.

[92] Cf. Hughes, Reformation, II, p. 208.

It should be said as well that there is a strong emphasis on the presence of Christ in the Supper among the liberals and radicals. The writings of these groups demonstrate this beyond question. The question appears to be, is this concept of the unique presence of Christ in the Supper, coupled with the denial of transubstantiation and the corporal presence, similar to anything in the Continental Reformation? Brilioth suggests that the English Reformers speak in Calvinistic terms. It is intended that a thorough examination of this suggestion be carried out. We must, however, begin with Luther.

II. THE CONTINENTAL EUCHARISTIC CONTROVERSY

Luther and Zwingli

We move now into the question of the Continental Eucharistic debate. We shall begin with the classic contrast on the subject of the Real presence in the Lord's Supper, the controversy between Luther and Zwingli. Following this discussion, it is proposed to discuss the positions of Calvin and Bullinger, with reference to the *Consensus Tigurinus*, and conclude with an examination of the positions of Martin Bucer and Peter Martyr.[1]

From Luther's *The Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ--Against the Fanatics*, written in 1526, we take this statement of the elements of the Sacrament. These are the object of faith and the faith itself:

---

[1] It is proposed to deal with the major figures of the Continental Eucharistic debate in the natural sets of two. The justification for this lies in the historical development of the debate--i.e. one finds these major figures either joining or opposing one another, and in that joining or opposing effecting the course of the debate. The historical *Sitz im Leben* of the Eucharistic controversy seems to make this approach a useful one. There can be no question that from the viewpoint of the beginning of the Continental debate these figures are the major ones. More important, however, for our purposes is their respective relationships to the English Eucharistic debate.

> the first lies outside the heart and is presented to our eyes externally, namely, the sacrament itself, concerning which we believe that Christ's body and blood are truly present in the bread and wine.[2]

There can be no doubt that Luther affirmed the presence of Christ's body and blood in the Sacrament throughout his long career as Reformer. Sasse affirms that there never was a time when Luther did not accept this understanding as the only one possible.[3] The question before us is this: in what did this presence consist? Further, what are the arguments set forth to substantiate this belief? Finally, what is the effect of this understanding of the presence upon the communicant?

Luther defined the basis for his doctrine of the Lord's Supper in the following words:

> Meine gründe aber darauff ich stehe ynn solchem stücke, sind diese: der erst ist dieser artickel unseres glaubens: Jesus Christus ist wesentlicher, natürlicher, wahrhafftiger, völliger Gott und mensche in einer person, unzutrennet und ungeteilet. Der ander: das Gottes rechte hand allenthalben ist. Der dritte: das Gottes wort nicht falsch ist odder lügen, der vierde: das Gott mancherley weise hat und weis etwa an einem Ort zu sein, und nicht allein die einige, da die schwermer von gauckeln, welche Pholisophi [sic] Localem nennen.[4]

---

[2] Helmut T. Lehmann, gen. ed., *Luther's Works*, Vol. 36: *Word and Sacrament II*, ed. Abdel Ross Wentz (55 Vols; Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1960), p. 335.

[3] Sasse, *Body*, p. 100.

[4] Fritz Heidler, *Christi Gegenwart Beim Abendmahl* (2nd rev. ed.; Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, GMBH, 1949), p. 25.

Sommerlath[5] emphasizes the scriptural basis of Luther's doctrine. For Luther "scriptural realism meant the bodily presence of Christ in the sacrament; he understood man's salvation to be wrapped up in the living Word made visible in the Lord's Supper. Just as the incarnate Christ was on earth in the body, so he is received bodily in the Lord's Supper."

In attempting to understand Luther's doctrine of the Eucharist, we can hardly improve on his understanding of the relation of scripture to the real presence as a starting point. Luther feels that he is imprisoned by the words.[6] Luther opposed Karlstadt for allowing logic to run into conflict with the holy scripture. Logic must be rejected, he argued, if it leads to statements contrary to the teaching of scripture. By allowing human reason to supercede scripture, Karlstadt had destroyed the basis of faith, and therefore true belief in God. "By drawing the conclusion that man receives only bread in Holy Communion", Karlstadt had rushed into scriptures with "unwashed feet". [7] Luther, in The Sacrament of the Body and the Blood of Christ--Against the Fanatics[8] declares:

---

[5] Helmut T. Lehmann, gen ed., Luther's Works, Vol. 35: Word and Sacrament I, ed. E. Theodore Bachmann (55 Vols; Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1960), pp. xv-xvi. Cf. Heidler, Gegenwart, p. 25, above, where Heidler's quotation from Luther is not necessarily in opposition to Sommerlath's stress on the scriptural argument of Luther; but it should be noted that Heidler is anxious to free Luther from the "literalism" tag which has been attached from time to time to him, cf. Gegenwart, pp. 13-14.

[6] It has been suggested that this indicates that "Luther's Eucharistic teaching is a relapse into Roman doctrine or that he has not yet freed himself from medieval categories." McDonnell rightly suggests that "it was not a question of the first hesitations of a young reformer, from which he later freed himself", referring to his doctrine of the presence based on scripture. "In the matter of the consecration and the elements his later teaching does not differ from his early teaching." McDonnell, Calvin, p. 67.

> we have before us the clear text and the plain words of Christ: 'Take, eat; this is my body, which is given for you. Drink of it, all of you, this is my blood, which is given for you. Do this in remembrance of me.' These are the words on which we take our stand. They are so simply and clearly stated that even they, our adversaries, must confess that it is difficult to interpret them otherwise. Yet they pass these clear words by and follow their own thoughts, making darkness for themselves in the midst of the bright light.[9]

It was through reading and comparison of scripture that Luther came to his statement, *Iustificatio sola fide*. The same source supplied his doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Armed with what seemed to him such clear truth, Luther can only explain the appearance of the "six or seven sects" on the matter of the Eucharist thus: it has occurred

> because in the first place they have not adhered to the words, and then because they have followed

---

[7] Reformation Studies. Essays in Honor of Roland H. Bainton, ed. Franklin H. Littel: "Faith and Knowledge in Luther's Theology", by N. Arne Bendtz (Richmond, Virginia: John Knox Press, 1962), p. 25.

[8] Referred to hereafter as Against the Fanatics--not to be confused with That These Words " This is my body", etc., Still Stand Against the Fanatics, which will be referred to as That These Words.

[9] Luther's Works, Vol. 36, pp. 335-336.

> their own thoughts and have seen that if Christ were present in the bread and wine and were distributed so widely everywhere and if each person were to eat this Christ, that would be an awkward situation...."[10]

They have refused to accept God's word as it stands, and continually force their own meanings out of it. Luther refuses to speculate. "What he says, I will keep."[11] Thus not only should the believer rest in the word as it appears; he should also reject human reason in its attempt to explain away difficult problems, i.e. the presence of Christ's body on so many altars.

God's word says that Christ is there. The "fanatics" have not thought this sufficient, and have thus erred. One should rebut these men with the argument of God's clear words;

> because in the sacrament Christ says in clear words: 'Take, eat, this is my body, etc.' it is my duty to believe these words, as firmly as I must believe all the words of Christ. If he handed me a mere straw and spoke these words, I should believe it.[12]

Again,

> Should it be so amazing that he enters into the bread and wine? Is not the heart much more tenuous and elusive than bread? You will probably not attempt to fathom how this comes about:.... But I...do know, that the word is there: 'Take, eat, this is my body, given for you , this do in remembrance of me'. When we say these words over the bread, then he is truly present, and yet it is a mere word and voice that one hears. Just as he

---

[10] *Ibid*., p. 337.

[11] *Ibid*.

[12] *Ibid*., pp. 344-345.

> enters the heart without breaking a hole in it, but is comprehended only through the Word and hearing, so also he enters into the bread without needing to make any hole in it.[13]

In his virulent That These Words of 1527, Luther continues to stress the truth of the clear words of scripture as the source of the real presence of the body and blood almost ad nauseam.

> The sum and substance of all this is that we have on our side the clear, distinct Scripture, which reads, 'Take, eat; this is my body,' and we are not under obligation nor will we be pressed to cite Scripture beyond this text--though we could do so abundantly.[14]

There is, nevertheless, the very real need for an explanation of the presence of Christ in many places at once, if Luther will affirm that Christ's body is present in the Sacrament. The power of God is clear, as his scriptures are clear.

> How do we become certain, good gentlemen, that a body may not through the power of God be at the same time in heaven and in the Supper, since the power of God has neither measure nor number, and does things which no mind can comprehend but must simply be believed? When he says, 'This is my body', how shall I calm my heart and convince it that God has no means or power to do what his Word says?

---

[13] Ibid., p. 341. Note other places where the scriptural basis as the source for the corporal presence is stressed, Ibid., p. 346 (vs. Karlstadt and Zwingli), and Luther's further complaint against those who spurn the clear words of scripture, Ibid., p. 348.

[14] Luther's Works, gen. ed. Helmut T. Lehmann, Vol. 37: Word and Sacrament III, ed. Robert H. Fischer (55 Vol.; Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1961), p. 33.

God's omnipotence makes whatever he wishes to do possible to do. He may even render a body visible at many places at once. Since the scriptures obviously concede this possibility to God, what argument of man can be successful?[15]

For Luther there is no question of the clear force of the word. The word says, "This is my body", and the argument is finished, for all scripture must be taken as true. It is of no help that the fanatics exhibit a high regard for scripture in every instance but this.[16]

In the confrontation at Marburg, October 1529, Luther labored this point further. "One must accept", he remonstrated with his opponents, " the Word of God."

> It is up to you to prove that the body of Christ is not here, when the Word says, "this is my body"! I do not want to hear reason. Carnal and geometrical arguments I repudiate altogether.... God is above all mathematics. The words of God are to be adored and observed with awe. God commands: 'Take eat; this is my body.' I desire persuasive proof from sacred scripture.[17]

At this point Luther took up a piece of chalk, lifted the tablecloth and wrote the words "Hoc est corpus meum" on the table. Later, in reply to the arguments of Oecolampadius, he insisted that Oecolampadius was wrong in imputing to him an eating like the eating of "bread and meat in a dish and like roast pork." Rather,

---

[15] Ibid., p. 47. Cf. Ibid., pp. 28-29, 42; also Jean Rilliet, Zwingli, Third Man of the Reformation, trans. Harold Knight (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964), pp. 230-232, this last from Luther's reply to Zwingli's Amica Exegesis, 1527.

[16] Luther's Works, Vol. 37, p. 26.

[17] Hans J. Hillerbrand, The Reformation (New York: Harper and Row, 1964), pp. 156-157.

> If I eat Christ bodily in the bread it is not an ordinary understanding, but a gift of the Holy Spirit. Thus it is not base or rejectable, but a superior eating. Man can believe the words that here is the body of Christ.[18]

Again, to Oecolampadius, Luther accepted his stress on the spiritual eating:

> We do not at all deny the spiritual eating, but teach and believe it to be necessary. But from this it does not follow that bodily eating is useless or unnecessary. I do not inquire whether it is necessary or not. This is not my business. It is written: 'Take, eat; this is my body.' Thus one must above all things do it and believe.[19]

Heidler wishes to maintain that despite the foregoing evidence for Luther's reliance on the word for his belief in the presence of the body and blood of Christ, the actual source of his belief is his christology.[20] We have already noted our

---

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 158.

[19] *Ibid.*, p. 160. Cf. *Quellen und Forschungen zur Reformationsgeschichte*, Band VII: *Zwingli und Luther: Ihr Streit über das Abendmahl nach seinen politischen und religiösen Beziehungen*, von Walther Köhler (2 vols.; Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1953), II, p. 94.

[20] Cf. p. 72, above, where Luther states his first basis for his teacing in christological terms. Heidler argues thus:

> Der Grund für diese seine Anschauung ist der Wortlaut der Einsetzungsworte, an denen er nicht gedeutelt wissen will, wie es die Schwärmer aber tun. Darum dann Blanke sagte: "Das viel

impression that Heidler is attempting to save Luther "embarrassment" over the issue of literalism. It appears that Heidler's argument is circular. If Luther's understanding of the Real Presence is based on christology, then his understanding of the Real Presence is still based on scripture. Luther's arguments regarding the presence of Christ at the right hand of the Father, his emphasis on the two natures distinct but not separate, are derived, as he continually tells us, from the teaching of the word. Given the fact that his teaching of the Real Presence is based on christology--and it seems quite clear that Luther realizes the christological implications of his arguments for the Real Presence--scripture is still the basis of Luther's doctrine of the Real Presence.[21]

Having given, it is hoped, scripture its rightful

---

verhandelte religiöse 'Interesse', von dem Luther im Abendmahlsstreit beherrscht ist, ist einfach das Interesse an der Autorität des Schriftwortes." Und Luther schreibt selbst: "...ich byn gefangen, kan nicht eraus: der text ist zu gewalltig da...." Dennoch wäre es falsch, den Grund für Luthers Lehre von dem Realpräsenz allein in seinem festhalten am Buchstaben der Schrift zu sehen. Denn er sagt selbst: "Wenn Christus ym abendmal diese wort 'das ist mein Leib' *gleich nie hette gesagt* noch gestetzt, so erzwingens doch diese wort, Christu sitzt zur Rechten Gotts, das sein leib und blut da möge sein wie an allen anderen Örtern." Diese Äusserung zeigt eindeutig, dass der Schwerpunkt für Luthers Begründung der Realpräsenzlehre in der *Christologie* zu suchen ist. Von seinem Christusglauben her kann Luther nicht anders, als ander tatsächlichen Gegenwart Jesu Christ in den Elementen des Abendmahls festzuhalten. *Gegenwart*, pp.13-14

[21] Luther is not concerned about his "Festhalten am Buchstaben der Schrift", though Heidler is.

place in Luther's teaching of the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Supper, we move to the question of the ubiquity of Christ. By upholding the position that the body of Christ was present everywhere (not only in the elements), Luther hoped to explain his support of the corporal presence of Christ in the Supper. The argument, on the face of it, has a certain attraction; for if Christ's body is indeed present in all of creation, then there can be no strong objection to its presence in the Supper. But other Reformers, among them Calvin, objected to this argument as one used to defend local presence, i.e. the presence of the whole Christ in a specific place, on the altar. For Calvin, the local presence is a crass presence. Luther objected here. He would not equate local presence with real presence, as Calvin does.

From Calvin's viewpoint, the body of Christ was unquestionably present in heaven. After the ascension, this was its place. But the body was present in the Sacrament; however, it was not present as a body is present in a place. "Let not the reality of the body be denied here simply because it is believed that it is present in various places;...." Rather, the body is really, truly, and forcefully present in the Supper, though the manner of presence is a mystery. What is present in heaven is present in the Sacrament.[22]

Luther's position was thus: Christ was everywhere. Hence we receive him in the bread.[23] In his

---

[22] McDonnell, Calvin, p. 64.

[23] Schempp makes the point that the so-called

Against the Fanatics he argues that there are more difficult things than Christ being present in the elements: if God can do these things, why can Christ, who is God, not be present in the elements? If it were possible for Luther to describe all the mysteries of nature, his opponents would understand that it is just as possible for Christ to be corporally present in the Supper. The prick of a needle can, for example, affect the entire soul, "and the whole man quivers".[24] Though Luther is unable to explain this phenomenon, this does not meant that it is not true. The same applies to the real presence.

The christological viewpoint is important to Luther's argument for ubiquity. Christ is God. Power which can be predicated of God can be predicated of Christ.

> Our faith maintains that Christ is God and man, and the two natures are one person, so that this person may not be divided in two; therefore, he can surely show himself in a corporeal, circumscribed manner at whatever place he will.... But now, since he is a man who is supernaturally one person with God, and apart from this man there is no God, it must follow that according to the third supernatural mode [i.e. the mode of Christ's ascension], he is and can be wherever God is and that everything is full of Christ through and through, even according to his humanity--not according to the first, corporeal, circumscribed

---

ubiquity teaching was never taught by Luther as clear scriptural truth, though he obviously did teach it. Rather, it was employed as a means of explanation which could be derived from the word. Paul Schempp, "Das Abendmal bei Luther", *Evangelische Theologie*, Heft 8 (Sept., 1935).

[24] *Luther's Works*, Vol. 36, pp. 338-339.

> mode, but according to the supernatural, divine mode. Here you must take your stand and say that wherever Christ is according to his divinity, he is there as a natural divine person and he is also naturally personally there, as his conception in his mother's womb proves conclusively.[25]

Luther is affirming that if God can be present in whatever manner and whatever place he chooses, we deny the divinity of Christ if we do not say the same of him. But Luther stresses that this does not mean that he is simply present according to his divine nature, but also according to his human nature. This argument runs throughout Luther's stand on the ubiquity of the body.

Luther, however, was thought to be in danger of Monophysitism, that is, of confusing the two natures, mixing them so that the human and divine natures were not distinct.

> They raise a hue and cry against us, saying that we mingle the two natures into one essence. This is not true. We do not say that divinity is humanity, or that the divine nature is the human nature, which would be confusing the natures into one essence. Rather, we merge the two distinct natures into one single person, and say: God is man and man is God.[26]

Luther goes on to accuse Zwingli of the opposite heresy, Nestorianism, for Zwingli separates the natures too completely, applying "all the texts concerning the passion only to the human nature and completely excluding them from the divine nature".[27] If God has been able to be present wholly and completely in all his creatures on the one hand, and on the other to be limited by no force in space and time, why cannot Christ, who is God, be present in all things at all times?[28]

---

[25] Luther's Works, Vol. 37, Confession Concerning Christ's Supper, p. 218.

[26] Ibid.,pp. 212-213.

Thus Luther asserts the presence of God, and therefore Christ, in all things.[29] God is present everywhere; thus to question Christ's presence in the Supper is to question God's presence everywhere. The latter cannot be denied. Christ was present at the Last Supper, as God was present at the Last Supper in him. Yet Christ was also in the bread:

> If Christ's body can sit at table and still be in the bread, then it can also be in heaven and anywhere else he wishes, and still be in the bread. Whether it is far from the table or near does not at all affect its being at the same time in the bread.[30]

To deny this is to believe that "God's power and wisdom extend no farther than the range of our sight, and that he is able to do no more than we can physically see and judge with our eyes or touch with our fingers".[31] God is omnipotent. We cannot restrict him to what we understand. Even the devil cannot accomplish anything by preventing the mode of Christ's presence in the Supper. He could only prove that such a mode was impossible; but God is onmipotent, and can by his power make the presence of Christ in the Supper possible. "...therefore I believe his words as they stand."[32]

---

[27] *Ibid*. [28] *Ibid*., *That These Words*, p. 60.

[29] Cf. Sasse, *Body*, pp. 155-156.

[30] *Luther's Works*, Vol. 37, *Confession*, p. 206, here referring to the belief that Christ not only served the Last Supper, but was the Last Supper--as must be believed if the words "This is my body" are to be taken in Luther's sense.

These and other forms of the argument were pressed by Luther at Marburg, to the controlled exasperation of his opponents. He addressed himself to *ratio naturae*. It asserts that a body cannot be in two places simultaneously. How can Christ be present both in heaven and in the bread? In so arguing, *ratio naturae* oversteps its bounds. "God can do far more than our thoughts suggest."[33]

Despite his passionate devotion to the *potentia absoluta Dei*, Luther could not simply ignore the statement of scripture and the creed, that Christ sits at the right hand of God, whence he will come to judge the living and the dead. Implied in the statement, from the anti-Lutheran Reformers' viewpoint, was the idea that Christ would not be present on earth until he came to judge the living and the dead. Luther did not let this implication go unanswered. His reply is based on his concept of the presence of God in all parts of creation--if God is present everywhere, his right hand is present everywhere.

---

[31] *Ibid*., p. 208.

[32] *Ibid*., pp. 208-209.

[33] Rilliet, *Zwingli*, p. 257. Peters suggests that Luther believed that without the presence of God, and thus Christ, in all things, they could not exist.

> Gott und Christus sind der Gesamten Schöpfung gegenwärtig, nicht so, wie es unserem raumgebundenen Denken und Vorstellen erscheint, als ob sie erst herbeieilen müssten; wo sie in einer Kreatur nicht sind, da sinkt diese in das Nichts zurück.

Arbeiten zur Geschichte und Theologie des Luthertums, Band V: *Realpräsenz: Luthers Zeugnis von Christi Gegenwart im Abendmahl*, von Albrecht Peters (Berlin: Lutherisches Verlagshaus, 1960), p. 82; and cf. pp. 86-87.

> Christ still sits on the right hand of the Father, and also in your heart, the one Christ who fills heaven and earth. I preach that he sits on the right hand of God and rules over all creatures, sin, death, life, world, devils and angels; if you believe this, you already have him in your heart.... So he dwells and sits in your heart, yet he does not fall from the right hand of God.[34]

He understands how the "fanatics" cannot accept the corporal presence, for they do not accept that Christ is anywhere but the heart; and this they base on reason.[35] The right hand of God is not "ein sonderlicher ort, wie den Schwermern treumet, da Christu leib sitze."[36] Christ did not have, as the "carnales cogitationes putant, certam sedem in celis sicut rex in terris", nor "ein gülden Stuhl". Rather, the right hand of God is "die gewalt Gotts selbs", "die allmechtige gewalt Gotts". Therefore, "muss sein Göttlich rechte hand, wesen und majestät auch allenthalben sein", "an allen orten".[37]

Since Christ's humanity is at the right hand of God, and also in all and above all,

---

[34] Luther's Works, Vol. 36, Against the Fanatics, pp. 340-341.

[35] Ibid.

[36] Heidler, Gegenwart, p. 19.

[37] Ibid. Cf. Luther's Works, Vol. 37, That These Words, pp. 57-58.

> You will not eat or drink him like the cabbage and soup on your table, unless he wills. He also now exceeds any grasp, and you will not catch him by groping about...unless he gives himself to you and summons you to a particular table by his Word, bidding you to eat him.[38]

The supreme authority of scripture never leaves the arguments of Luther, so essential is it to his case. The belief in the ubiquity of Christ is no exception. Even after establishing the point that Christ is everywhere, the reception of Christ at the Eucharist is still determined by Christ's word that he is present. Under no circumstance shall man control the power and will of God.

To be at the right hand of God means to have power and rule.[39] Having power and rule at the right hand of the Father, Christ must therefore surely be present, in his rule and power, in all things. Given this truth, Luther has yet another string to his bow for the real presence.

> Even if Christ had never spoken or set forth these words at the Supper, "This is my body", still the words, "Christ sits at the right hand of God", would require that his body and blood may be there as well as at all other places, and that although there need be no transubstantiation or transformation of the bread into his body, it can well be present nonetheless, just as the right hand of God is not necessarily transformed into all things even though it is surely present and in them. How this takes place, however,

---

[38] Luther's Works, Vol. 37, That These Words, p. 69.

[39] Ibid., p. 64.

> is not for us to know; we are to believe it, since the Scriptures and the articles of faith so irrefutably confirm it.[40]

Luther wishes to establish the presence of Christ in the bread; and this he attempts with the arguments we have noted. But he will not be accused of too crude an understanding of the presence. His concept of the use of the ubiquity argument bears this out.

> We poor sinners...are not so foolish as to believe that Christ's body is in the bread in a crude visible manner, like bread in a basket or wine in a cup, a belief with which the fanatics would like to saddle us, to amuse themselves with our folly. But we believe precisely that his body is present, as he words say and indicate: "This is my body". When the fathers and we occasionally say, "Christ's body is in the bread", we do so quite simply because by our faith we wish to confess that Christ's body is present.... Over words we do not wish to argue, just so the meaning is retained that it is not mere bread that we eat in Christ's Supper, but the body of Christ.[41]

Luther concludes his argument for the ubiquity of Christ by asserting that God's right hand is something above and apart from all creatures; for only God is everywhere. Therefore God's right hand is omnipresent. This is the teaching of the Word of God, which the fanatics have bypassed. Luther holds to the "clear and correct ground" of scripture and the articles of faith in this understanding.[42] Thus Christ, in human-divine form of the assumption, is present in the Supper, for he is at the right hand of God, and the "right hand of God is everywhere".[43]

---

[40] Ibid., pp. 64-65. [41] Ibid.

[42] Ibid., p. 63.

Luther's argument for the ubiquity of the body of Christ may have seemed to him to have solved the question of how it would be possible for Christ, who is at the right hand of the Father, to be present in the bread. The question of the role of the elements themselves, however, was another matter. If Christ can be said to be present in the elements, what effect does this presence have on the nature of the bread and wine? They obviously continue to exist, so far as the senses are concerned. The doctrine of transubstantiation[44] had been suggested as a solution to the problems of the means by which the substance of Christ might be in the elements without affecting their external appearance. Schindel[45] suggests that in

---

[43] Referring to the presence according to the third mode, i.e. the form of the assumption, Heidler notes,

> Wir errinnern uns dabei daran, dass Christus (nach Luther) bei dieser sakramentlichen Gegenwart in Seiner zweiten, unbegreiflichen Weise da ist (wie damals im Stein des Grabes, im Holz der Tür, unmittelbar nach der Auferstehung), während Er zu *gleicher* Zeit die dritte Weise hat, *überall* zu sein, hat Christus nach Luther nur, weil Ihm nach der Himmelfahrt die dritten übernatürliche, himmlische Seinsweise eignet, in der Er allenthalben ist. So liegt in der mit der Erhöhung zur Rechten Gottes empfangen *Ubiquität* des Leibes Christi die *Voraussetzung* und die *Notwendigkeit* Seines sakramentlichen Daseins, wie Luther es versteht. *Gegenwart*, p. 22, cf. p. 18.

[44] See Appended Note A.

[45] Martin Luther, *A Treatise Concerning the Blessed Sacrament of the Holy and True Body of Christ*, etc., trans. J. J. Schindel (no place: no publisher, no date), p. 19.

1519, when he wrote the Treatise Concerning the Blessed Sacrament of the Holy and True Body of Christ, Luther still affirmed transubstantiation. Thus Luther writes,

> He did not appoint this two-fold form by itself /I.e. the two elements/, but gave his true natural flesh, in the bread, and his natural true blood, in the wine, that he might give us a really perfect sacrament or sign. For just as the bread is changed into his true natural body and the wine into his true natural blood, that is, into the fellowship of Christ and all saints, and put by this sacrament in possession of all the virtues and mercies of Christ and his Saints etc.....[46]

By the time of the writing of The Babylonian Captivity,[47] Luther had rejected the notion of transubstantiation as the work of man, unfounded in scripture.

The question regarding the relationship between the elements and the body of Christ remains, however. As we have already seen, the authority of the word was his stay in this matter. Christ had said, "This is my body"; and the problem of the existence of the elements took a place decidedly inferior to the words of scripture. Luther constantly and consistently affirmed that we are not asked to understand the presence of Christ in the Supper and its relationship to the elements, only to accept the authority of scripture. He did, however, realize that he must develop the matter to a degree beyond blind obedience to the letters. For instance, he suggests that like a small spot in the midst of a gem which appears to the viewer as a part of one of the facets, so Christ, "in the midst of all creatures", appears to the recipient in the bread and wine not as a spot which merely appears to be there, but as a truly extant entity, present through the creating word of God.[48]

---

[46] Ibid.

[47] Luther's Primary Works, ed. Henry Wace and C. A. Buchheim (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1896), pp. 294ff.

Luther is usually thought to have asserted consubstantiation to support his belief in the presence of Christ, "in, cum, sub" the elements.[49] Consubstantiation, as has been admitted for some time, was never used _qua verbum_ by Luther.[50] Nevertheless, as McDonnell states, " an essential characteristic of Luther's eucharistic doctrine is the radical manner in which Christ is bound up with the elements, yet not limited by the elements."[51] That both the elements and the body and blood of Christ continue to exist is Luther's point. They are bound together.[52]

---

[48] Peters, _Realpräsenz_, p. 83.

[49] Van De Poll states that Luther's understanding of consubstantiation is adopted from Pierre d'Ailly, G. J. Van De Poll, _Martin Bucer's Liturgical Ideas_ (Groningen: Van Gorcum & Comp. N.V.--G.A. Hak & Dr. J. Prakke, 1954), p. 84.

[50] Cf. McDonnell, _Calvin_, p. 63. [51] _Ibid_.

[52] "When Luther says that Christ is in, under, and with the bread, this is not to be understood as a spatial relationship, but rather a not too clear description of the identity between the elements and the sacrificial body of Christ." _Ibid_.

Luther is clearly not very happy with philosophical attempts to demonstrate how the two entities, the elements and the body, can co-exist. Such reliance on human tradition caused him to reject transubstantiation. There are those, he explains, who are concerned with such questions as the effects of transubstantiation on the substance of the bread and wine. Such speculation is misleading, for we know from God's promise that Christ is present in the elements.[53]

Luther's position, despite some hesitant attempts to make himself clear on the matter, is that the manner in which Christ comes to be present is not important. Speculation leads only to confusion, while the word is clear. Christ gives us his body to eat in the bread. We must understand clearly that Christ is truly and corporally present in the Supper. How this is effected is not our concern.[54]

The power of the word is the explanation for the presence of Christ in the elements. Under this rubric Luther can introduce the work of the Holy Spirit, an interesting point in light of Calvin's understanding of the same question of the relationship of the elements and the body.[55] "Denn sobald Christus spricht: Das ist mein Leib, so ist sein Leib da durchs Wort und Kraft des Heiligen

---

[53] Schindel, _Treatise_, p. 20.

[54] _Beiträge zur Förderung Christlicher Theologie_, Band 47: _Die Abendmahlslehre bei Luther und Calvin_, von Hans Grass (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1959), p. 122.

[55] For which, see below _re_: Calvin.

Geists."[56]

Luther's metaphor of the hot iron is his most famous attempt to make the juncture of body and elements clear:

> ...if we heed the simple sense of the language we can say of a glowing piece of iron, "It is fire", or "the iron lying there is pure fire".... Since now iron is fire and fire is iron, according to the simple sense of language the two are in each other and as one, though each retains its own nature, they [the "heavenly prophets"] might well have exercised humility, foregoing their cleverness and smartness, and following Christ and all the world in the simple meaning of the word and say of the bread, "This is my body". This would mean the same as saying, bread and body are as one or in each other, as fire and iron. No one is so stupid as to deny that body and bread are two different things.[57]

Bucer found in Luther's concept of the sacramental unity a concept with which he would agree, and thus wholeheartedly urge the end of the Eucharistic controversy. The concept of the sacramental unity, consisting essentially in what we have seen already, allowed for the existence both of the bread and of the body. As one says that a bright light is "in one's eye", as the light is reflected in the eye, so Christ is present in the Supper. Luther wishes to show, using such illustrations as these, that we must not understand the presence of Christ in the Supper in too material a sense. Rather, Christ is present in the elements as a heavenly substance. Thus Luther speaks of "sacramental union", rather than consubstantiation; for the latter lays too much weight on a strictly material interpretation of the presence.[58]

---

[56] Peters, Realpräsenz, pp. 64,65. McDonnell comments: "Just as at the first creation it is the Spiritus Creator who works, so also it is the Spiritus Creator who effects the presence of the body and blood of Christ under the species of wine and bread." Calvin, p. 68. This elements of creation appears in That These Words, Luther's Works, Vol. 37, p. 43: "Thus the bread should be called his body for two reasons, first on account of creation, etc....."

[57] Luther's Works, gen. ed. Helmut T. Lehmann, Vol. 40: Church and Ministry II, ed. Conrad Bergendoff (55 vols.; Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1958), p. 196, Against the Heavenly Prophets. Luther also used the metaphor of the bag with a hundred crowns. The phrase "There are one hundred crowns" is applicable both to the bag and the money. Cf. Rilliet, Zwingli, pp. 237-238.

Luther sums of the question of the relationship of the elements to the body pungently in his Sermon on the Lord's Supper of 1526. "Dies Brot is ja der Leib Christi, gleich wei die Taube der heilige Geist ist, und die Flamme der Engel ist."[59] Christ is in the bread not in a common sense; and thus when we speak of Christ being "in" the bread, we use the preposition in an uncommon fashion, as a "Formel für etwas Unaussprechliches". In our reasoning we are accustomed to thinking of the word "in" as straw is "in" a sack, or bread "in" a basket. But we should know this: that when we think of God being in this or that, he is not "in" it in the sense we have just noted. Rather, he is in, over, around, under, and present through and through the thing. Luther finally laments, "Ach, was rede ich von so hohen Dingen die doch unaussprechlich sind".[60]

---

[58] Heidler, Gegenwart, p. 23.

[59] Grass, Abendmahlslehre, p. 123.

Luther berated the group he called the "fanatics" for their stubborn attempts to change the clear words of scripture. His language on this matter is strong throughout; for him the question is finally settled by the words, "This is my body". But Zwingli, Oecolampadius, and Karlstadt insisted that one must understand these words in light of the figurative language of John 6. There Christ uses such phrases as " I am the vine", or "I am the door", " I am the shepherd", "I am the resurrection and the life". Zwingli and his colleagues argued that these obviously figurative usages should inform the correct understanding of the copulative "*est*", in the latin phrase "*Hoc est corpus meum*". Variations on this theme can be seen throughout the writings of Oecolampadius, Zwingli, and Karlstadt.

Luther flatly refused to accept any tampering with the clear meaning of scripture. He resists the interpretation of "*est*" as "*significat*". "Whoever read in the Scriptures that 'body' means the same as 'sign of the body', and 'is' means the same as 'represents'?"[61] One cannot wring out of scripture what is not there. Dr. Oecolampadius' understanding of "body" as "sign of the body" cannot be proven from scripture; for the words of Christ are clear--body means body. Nor can he demonstrate his case from any other part of scripture.[62]

---

[60] *Ibid.*, pp. 125-126.

[61] *Luther's Works*, Vol. 37, *That These Words*, p. 31.

Zwingli adduced for his argument the figurative use of the phrase "the rock was Christ", from the Pauline corpus. Luther tries this statement by the reductio ad absurdum. If "This is my body" means "This signifies my body", we may draw similarly absurd statements from other parts of scripture. For example, since Luke writes that Mary remained a virgin, then Sarah, the mother of the Jews, must have remained a virgin. This is simply absurd.[63] Zwingli has tampered with scripture. Luther denounces him in strong terms: "I testify on my part that I regard Zwingli as un-Christian, with all his teaching, for he holds and teaches no part of the Christian faith rightly."[64]

A further important point of dissension between Luther and the "fanatics" lay in their respective concepts of flesh and spirit. This applies to the teaching on the presence; for Zwingli argued that "the flesh profits nothing", and therefore nothing is gained by the corporal presence of Christ in the Supper. It is contrary to this scripture. Luther opposed such a radical use of this idea.

---

[62] Ibid., p. 40. [63] Ibid., p. 37.

[64] Note other similar arguments regarding Christ as the true vine, Ibid., Confession, p. 174, and Karlstadt's understanding of the words of Institution, Luther's Works, Vol. 40, Against the Heavenly Prophets, p. 154. For Luther's judgment of Zwingli, Luther's Works, Vol. 37, Confession, p. 231.

In his Treatise Concerning the Blessed Sacrament of 1519, Luther had held that the essence of the Sacrament lies in the fact that it incorporates the participant in the spiritual body of Christ. The elements are only signs of that incorporation. But in his Adoration of the Sacrament, 1523,[65] he makes the distinction between the spiritual body of Christ, which is the inclusive body of all believers, and the corporal body, which is distributed in the Sacraments.[66]

The physical eating of Christ was rejected by Luther himself in That These Words:

> When have you ever heard from us that we eat Christ's Supper, or teach that it should be eaten, in such a way that there is only an outward, physical eating of the body of Christ? Have we not taught in many books that in the Supper two things are to be kept in mind? One, which is the supreme and most necessary point, consisting of the words, "Take, eat, this is my body, etc."; the other is the sacramental or physical eating of the body of Christ.... Now what does he [the communicant] take to heart through these words? nothing else than what they say, viz. "the body

---

[65] Luther's Works, Vol. 36, pp. 269ff.

[66] Cf. ibid., p. xi. "In this connection Luther stressed the Pauline idea...that unworthy guests at the communion also receive the Lord's body. This became one of the points of distinction between Luther's view of the real presence of Christ in the sacrament and the view of other leading reformers." Ibid.

> which was given for us," which is the spiritual eating. We have said, further, that if anyone physically eats the sacrament without these words or without this spiritual eating, it is not only of no avail to him, but even harmful.... Therefore you did not need to teach us that physical eating is of no avail. We actually go further and say that physical eating is even poisonous and deadly.[67]

This does not mean, however, that the physical body is not present. How, then, does Luther explain the physical eating as was written of it above? The mouth eats physically, but the heart eats spiritually.

> ...the heart knows well what the mouth eats, for it grasps the words and eats spiritually what the mouth eats physically. But since the mouth is the heart's member, which lives eternally through the Word, here it also eats physically the same eternal food which its heart eats spiritually at the same time.[68]

This complicated statement appears to mean that while there is physical eating it is dependent on and/or subordinate to spiritual eating, just as the mouth is dependent on and/or subordinate to the heart.

At Marburg Luther specified three kinds of sacramental eating.[69] The first was the spiritual eating, which is faith. The second was the Capernaite eating, as described in John 6, which is a crass consumption of the physical body of Christ. The third type was the sacramental eating, as seen in the institution of the

---

[67] Luther's Works, Vol. 37, That These Words, p. 86.

[68] Ibid., pp. 86-87.

[69] Grass, Abendmahlslehre, p. 128.

Supper. While Luther is clearly convinced of the manducatio oralis, he rejects the Capernaite eating.[70] At the 2 October meeting at Marburg, Luther rejected the metaphorical nature of the words of institution. On the other hand, he rejected the carnal eating as described in John 6. This did not eliminate, for Luther, the physical presence of Christ. "You assert", he declared, "that God commands nothing that is incomprehensible: I cannot admit that." The physical presence was the act of the omnipotent God, described in scripture. The physical presence was not to be denied. There was the question of the eating of that physical presence. "We eat in faith", he said, " that body which is given for us."[71] The flesh, then, cannot be said to be of no avail; for the body of Christ is, according to scripture, present in the Supper. Further, the flesh of Christ is the flesh of the incarnation. The incarnation is not valueless.

> If his flesh is not present in the sacrament for the reason that flesh is of no avail, neither is it in his mother's womb, precisely for the same reason that it is of no avail.[72]

Thus Zwingli's motto, if taken to its conclusion, made the incarnation worthless, and this could not be conceded.

---

[70] "quae (sc. comestio sacramentalis) hanc habet rationem, ut corpus Christi edatur quidem in pane praesens, sed non dilanietur, quemadmodum Capernaitae intelligebant." Ibid.

[71] Rilliet, Zwingli, p. 259.

[72] Luther's Works, Vol. 37, That These Words, p. 82.

An explanation for Luther's comments can be found in his concept of flesh and spirit. He contended that one ought not to separate flesh and spirit in terms of appearance. Rather, it was possible for flesh which came from the spirit to be spiritual. Luther could, then, argue for the existence of spiritual flesh, and fleshly flesh. All things which had been touched by the Spirit were spiritual, whether they appeared to be spiritual or not. This distinction Zwingli did not accept; and thus their arguments were fated to end in dissension. Luther argued thus:[73]

> In the first place, the term "spiritual eating, drinking, or handling" is not to be used when that which one eats, drinks, or handles is a spirit or a spiritual object. For then Christ's flesh could not be spiritually eaten or drunk, since Christ's flesh wherever it may be--in a spiritual or in a material or physical object, visibly or invisibly--is of nature true, physical flesh which one can grasp, feel, see, and hear, which was born of a woman and died on the cross. Rather, it is called "spiritual" because it comes from the Spirit, and needs to be and must be partaken of by us in a spiritual way. "The object is not always spirit but its use must be spiritual.".... I hope now that all this had made it perfectly clear what "spiritual" means. Surely "spiritual" must mean what the Spirit does and what comes from the Spirit, just as "fleshly" is what flesh does and what comes from the flesh....

Given this understanding of the distinction between spiritual and fleshly, Luther can easily and consistently argue that the eating of the body of Christ in the Supper is a spiritual eating, for the body of Christ is a spiritual body, though it consists of flesh. The action of the Spirit is all-important in this distinction. The Spirit makes possible the spiritual eating of the physical body. It makes possible an eating of the body which is not after the manner of the Capernaites. Finally it makes possible both the sacramental unity of body and elements, and the participation in the body of Christ. His concept of spiritual and physical is a crucial point for Luther's concept of the presence and eating of Christ in the Supper, setting him quite apart from Zwingli.

---

[73] *Ibid*., pp. 89, 93.

> The
>
> fanatics, however, are full of fraud and humbug. They think nothing spiritual can be present where there is anything material and physical, and assert that flesh is of no avail. Actually the opposite is true. The Spirit cannot be with us except in material and physical things such as the Word, water, and Christ's body and in his saints on earth.[74]

They praise the spiritual eating, thinking they have conquered the arguments of Luther. They preach a "great teaching and praise of the spiritual eating of the body of Christ and of his remembrance--over which no one contends with them; we know about these things just as well as they, and before them!"[75] Luther does not deny that flesh is often placed in opposition to spirit. But it is "incontrovertible...that where flesh is placed in opposition to spirit, it does not mean Christ's body but the old Adam born of the flesh".[76] Rather, Christ's flesh must be understood in terms of the passage, "That which is spirit is spirit." Christ was born of the Holy Spirit, not of flesh, as even children confess when they say, " I believe in Jesus Christ our Lord, who was conceived by the Holy Spirit".[77]

---

[74] *Ibid.*, p. 94.

[75] *Ibid.*, p. 30.

We ought briefly to note some of the implications of Luther's position on the Real Presence as he saw them. Peters states that the idea of communion is almost forgotten by Luther.[78]. This does not appear to be an accurate statement of the situation. In his *Treatise Concerning the Blessed Sacrament*, he states,

> It is his will, then, that we partake of it [the Supper] frequently, in order that we may

---

[76] *Ibid.*, p. 96.

[77] *Ibid.*, p. 98. Cf. pp. 85, 100. While it is not our intention to discuss Luther's opposition to the concept of the Eucharist as a sacrifice, or as an *opus operatum*, since we are concerned with the controversy over the Real Presence, there is no question of this opposition. Cf. Schindel, *Treatise*, pp. 22-23; Grimm, *Reformation*, p. 197; Roland H. Bainton, *The Reformation of the Sixteenth Century* (Boston: The Beacon Press, 1952), p. 48; Hans Bernhard Meyer, *Luther und Die Messe: Eine liturgiewissenschaftliche Untersuchung über das Verhältnis Luthers zum Messwesen des späten Mittelalters* (Paderborn: Verlag Bonifacius-Druckerei, 1965), pp. 285-286.

[78] Peters, *Realpräsenz*, pp. 140ff.

> remember him and exercise ourselves in this fellowship according to his example. For if his example were no longer kept before us, the fellowship also would soon be forgotten, so we at present see to our sorrow that many masses are held and yet the Christian fellowship which should be preached, practiced and kept before us by Christ's example has quite perished.[79]

Further, "to receive the bread and wine of this Sacrament, then, is nothing else than to receive a sure sign of this fellowship and incorporation with Christ and all the saints." It is as though a citizen had been given some document or symbol testifying to his citizenship.[80]

The idea of communio in the Supper is closely related to Luther's insistence on the real presence. The communion of the Sacrament is a venerable idea, present in the early Fathers. This communio is presented to us in two ways: first, it is shown to us by the example of Christ; second, it is shown to us by the sign of the elements. Thus in the Supper every participant comprehends the whole christian belief in the work of Christ on our behalf. Thus are we joined to him. Further, the Fathers always thought it most appropriate that Christ had signified himself by symbols, i.e. the bread and wine, in which he is present, which are themselves constituted by the fusing together of many things.[81]

Another implication of the real presence for

---

[79] Schindel, Treatise, p. 16. [80] Ibid., p. 11.

[81] Luther's Works, Vol. 36, Against the Fanatics, pp. 352-353.

Luther is that since Christ is present in the Sacrament, it is a source of confidence that one is joined to Christ and receives constant help from him. If anyone is in despair, or burdened by conscience, Luther urges him to take the Sacrament. The "immeasurable" grace and mercy of God are gifts of this Sacrament, in order that we may find great comfort in tribulation. Such mercy assures us that we have been forgiven our sins; for the Sacrament is a sign of the promise of God to forgive us. "The heart cannot but rejoice and be comforted."[82] "We need the strength, support and help of Christ and of his saints, which are pledged us in this sacrament as by a sure token, by which we are made one with them and are incorporated with them."[83]

> In the sacrament we become united with Christ, and are made one body with all the saints, so that he concerns himself for us and acts on our behalf, as though he were what we are--what concerns us concerns him as much as us, and even more than us; and on the other hand, that we also concern ourselves for him, as though we were what he is, as indeed we shall finally be when we are conformed to his likeness.[84]

The emphasis on the unity with Christ and comfort of the Sacrament in shoring up confidence in Christ is clearly stated also in *Against the Fanatics*:

> If Christ were not with me in dungeon, torture, and death, where would I be? He is present there through the Word, although not in the same way as

---

[82] Schindel, *Treatise*, p. 13.

[83] *Ibid*., p. 15, cf. p. 25.

[84] *Ibid*., p. 18.

> through the Word, although not in the same way as here in the sacrament, where through the Word he binds his body and blood so that they are also received corporeally in the bread and wine. If we believe the one, it is easy also to grasp and believe the other.[85]

This confidence in the union with Christ through adversity derives mainly from the promise of the forgiveness of sins which is found in the Eucharist.[86] Luther was exceedingly disturbed with the "fanatics" because their denial of the physical presence of Christ in the Supper hindered, he thought, faith in Christ's promise of forgiveness of sins. The "fanatics" denied this promise to the communicant, thus depriving him of confidence in the love of God and the activity of Christ from him. Confuting Zwingli,[87] he argues that even if it were granted that Christ's body were not given in the Supper for the sake of our sins, it could not be shown that the body is not present. If Christ's activity of forgiveness is to be limited solely to his crucifixion, then he cannot forgive us from heaven. It could even be shown that he was not in heaven, given this premise. Forgiveness, then, comes from Christ at all times and in all places. The Supper is no exception. But we say that there is forgiveness of sins in the Supper not because of the merit gained by receiving it, but rather on account of the word through which the desired forgiveness is promised, i.e. "This is my body which is given for you."[88]

---

[85] Luther's Works, Vol. 36, p. 343.

[86] Cf. Sasse, Body, p. 113: "After 1520 it becomes evident that for Luther the real gift and fruit of the Lord's Supper is the forgiveness of sins." (Ital. Sasse).

[87] Luther's Works, Vol. 37, Confession, p. 191.

Every christian must know that the body and blood are given for the forgiveness of sins. This sounds very much like a concept of _opus operatum_, like the idea that the forgiveness of sins is derived from the Supper itself, without reference to Christ's activity or to the communicant.

> Those who go to the sacrament, however, should believe and be assured not only that they are receiving the true body and blood of Christ in it, but also that it is there given to them and is their own. Why? Not as a work for the sake of money or merit, as the monks and priests hold mass, but for the forgiveness of sins.[89]

On the other hand, there can be no doubt in the mind of the communicant that forgiveness of sins is closely related to the Supper. Luther suggests that everyone should know and remember these words whenever persecution comes to him:

> Here my Lord has given me his body and blood in the bread and wine, in order that I should eat and drink. And they are to be my very own, so that I may be certain that my sins are forgiven, that I am to be free of death and hell, have eternal life, and be a child of God and an heir of heaven.[90]

---

[88] _Ibid_.

[89] _Luther's Works_, Vol. 36, _Against the Fanatics_, p. 349.

[90] _Ibid_., pp. 349, 350. Cf. p. 348. Peters argues that Luther's famous statements in _That These Words_,

> Der mund, der Hals, der Leib, der Christus Leib isset, soll seinen Nutz auch davon haben, dass er ewiglich lebe und am Jüngsten tage auferstehe zur ewigen Seligkeit,

or the apparent teaching of the medicine of immortality, Luther states in his *That These Words,*

> Bread and wine are eaten and drunk for the forgiveness of sins: that is, because Christ ordained them to be eaten and drunk in order to keep his remembrance, it is proper to call this an eating and drinking of the forgiveness of sins, since in connection with it we should remember that forgiveness.[91]

---

which seems to indicate the type of realism of the Roman belief, must be understood in terms of the link between the forgiveness of sins and the Supper, of which there can be no doubt. When Luther says that we have assurance of sins through the Supper, we have assurance that we will be saved on the last day. Thus in this fasion should the "medicine of immortality" be understood. It is not useful to say that this was erratic and "non-lutheran". Indeed, it is merely the strongest statement of Luther on the relationship between the assurance of forgiveness and the Supper. It is true, nevertheless, that the aspect of communion in the Supper has almost been forgotten by Luther in this writing. Peters, *Realpräsenz*, pp. 140ff.

[91] *Luther's Works*, Vol. 37, *That These Words*, pp. 44-45, cf. p. 71; and further his argument that the value of the physical eating with faith is that

> it strengthens the soul by virtue of the fact that it believes it is Christ's body which the mouth eats, and so faith clings to the body which is in the bread. Now that which lifts, bears, and binds faith is not useless but salutary. Similarly, the mouth, the throat, the body, which eats Christ's body, will also have its benefit in that it will live forever and arise on the Last Day to eternal salvation. This is the secret power and benefit which flows from the body of Christ into our body, for it must be useful, and cannot be present in vain.

p. 134.

Grass stresses the importance of the forgiveness of sins for Luther.[92] The authority of the word is crucial for Luther--this much is surely clear. The word not only commands the presence of Christ in the Supper, it makes possible the reception of the body of Christ in the Supper. But still more, for Luther the word guarantees the forgiveness of sins in the context of the physical presence.[93] Peters concurs, making the point that in the words spoken through the mouth of the priest by Christ, not only blood and wine are present, but also the assurance of forgiveness of sins. But this assurance must be received by the believing heart. One ought to believe not only that the flesh and blood of Christ are present in the Sacrament, but also that Christ is there as the forgiving Lord, the Lord who forgives "me", through the word which enters into my heart and into my body through the elements of the Supper. Thus are my soul and body brought into a state of uniform forgiveness.[94]

Ernst Bizer would claim that Luther's teaching of the Lord's Supper may be characterised by his emphasis on the authority of the word to give meaning to the Supper; and to promise forgiveness of sins.[95] This appears to be a fair summary of Luther; for from the central position of the word can be derived the real presence, the promise of forgiveness, and the implications we have discussed.

---

[92] Grass, Abendmahlslehre, p. 32.

[93] Ibid., p. 95:
Aber das Wort enthält ja mehr, nämlich neben der Aussage über die Gegenwart von Leib und Blut auch nach die Zusage der am Kreuz durch die Hingabe von Leib und Blut erworbenen Sündenvergebung.

[94] Peters, Realpräsenz, pp. 66-67.

We turn now to a discussion of Zwingli's concept of the Eucharist. Rilliet suggests[96] that Zwingli of the years 1522 to 1524 was concerned more with constructing an argument against the mass as sacrifice than opposing Luther's (and the Roman Church's) idea of the corporal presence of Christ in the Supper. It was for this reason, Rilliet suggests, that we find rather hazy statements on the matter of the real presence in the Supper at this point. Rilliet cites a sentence from the letter to Wyttenbach of this period: "The eucharist is eaten where there is faith." Further,

> Communion is particularly necessary to the weak who without it would fail to perceive the body and blood of Christ. The infirmi must communicate more frequently than the strong; the latter will come of themselves to spiritual food.

These quotations, despite their relative obscurity, certainly seem to suggest that for Zwingli the principle of a spiritual eating was not to be rejected.[97] In 1524, Zwingli examined the letter of Cornelis Hoen which, he acknowledges, settled his doctrine of the Eucharist.[98] McDonnell states that from this time forward, Zwingli was no longer satisfied with "spiritualizing the Roman doctrine", but set out boldly his "significative interpretation".[99] Whether this be accurate or not, what is clear is that he drew both Lutheran and Roman doctrines under his censure.[100]

---

[95] Ernst Bizer und Walter Kreck, "Die abendmahlslehre in den reformatorischen Bekenntnisschriften", Theologische Existenz Heute, N.F. 47 (1955), p. 41:

> Das Wort (als Konsekrationswort) bringt Leib und Blut Christi in die Elemente, denn das Wort bringt mit sich, wovon es redet.... Das Wort als Verkündigungs- und Austeilungswort aber gibt die Gabe, und zwar sowohl die Sündenvergebung als auch Leib und Blut Christi als Pfand und Zeichen dieser Vergebung.

[96] Rilliet, Zwingli, p. 220.

---

[97] Ibid.:

> The strong also receive in themselves the body and blood of Christ. But this reception does not depend on the frequency of communion. It belongs to the sphere of the Spirit. The firm believer, temporarily absent from the altar, is constantly nourished by the sacrifice of Jesus Christ.

[98] November, 1524. Zwingli says,

> I realized that the words "this is my body" were meant symbolically, but did not know in which word was the symbol.

Learning of the letter from Hoen, and reading it, he declares,

> There I found the precious pearl: that the "is" of the words of institution must be understood as "means".

Hillerbrand, Reformation, p. 151. Cf. Sasse's account of Zwingli and the letter from Hoen, Body, pp. 122-123.

[99] McDonnell, Calvin, p. 86.

[100] Cf. Luther's Works, Vol. 37, p. xvi., regarding this early period:

> Zwingli time and again related the development of the controversy, claiming that he had acquired his understanding of the gospel before Luther's name became famous. This claim is debatable.

Moreover,

The letter of Hoen deserves quotation at length:

> Thus anyone receiving communion, the pledge of his groom, who sacrifices himself according to his testimony, must firmly believe that Christ is his, given for him and his blood shed for him. He will then turn his heart from everything which he hitherto loved and will trust only in Christ.... This is what it means to eat Christ and to drink his blood, as the Savior says in John 6: "He who eats my flesh and drinks my blood stays in me and I in him." He who receives communion without such faith eats Jewish bread rather than Christ. But some insist that the Word of God says, "This is my body." Yes, you have the Word of God. The apostles, however, did not talk in such a fashion about this sacrament. They broke "bread", and spoke about "bread", and said nothing about the Roman interpretation. Paul does not contradict my argument in First Corinthians 10. To be sure, he asks, "The bread which we break, is it not the body of Christ?" It is almost obvious therefore that the _is_ must be explained by _signifies_.... We must distinguish between the bread which is received by the mouth and the Christ who is received by faith. Whoever does not so distinguish the body of the Lord and thinks he is receiving nothing but what he receives with the mouth, is guilty of the body and blood of the Lord and eats and drinks to his judgment.[101]

There are present in this letter essential features of Zwingli's doctrine: (1) first, his assertion that to eat Christ is to trust in him, to believe in him; (2) then, Zwingli's constant emphasis

---

he insisted that he had learned from Hoen in 1524 only an exegetical explanation for a view acquired long before. In reality, though he had shared the widespread Erasmian emphasis on the spiritual eating of faith in connection with the Sacrament, he did not abandon transubstantiation until 1523.

[101] Hillerbrand, _Reformation_, pp. 149-150.

on the role of Faith in the Supper; (3) thirdly, the idea that in the light of John 6 and the description of the Last Supper, one ought to read _significat_ for _est_ in the words of institution; and (4) the distinction between physical and spiritual eating. If Zwingli correctly understood his own sources for his teaching, he owed a great deal to Cornelis Hoen.

Zwingli, like Luther, opposed the concept of the mass as sacrifice. In his Sixty-Seven Conclusions, drawn from the disputation held in January 1523, we note Conclusion 18:

> Christ, having sacrificed himself once is to eternity a certain and valid sacrifice for the sins of the faithful. Therefore the mass is not a sacrifice, but is a remembrance of the sacrifice and assurance of the salvation which Christ has given us.[102]

He went so far, in the Exposition of the Sixty-Seven Conclusions, as to say that "there is no dispute as to whether the body and blood of Christ are eaten and drunken, for no Christian has that in doubt, but the dispute is whether it is a sacrifice or only a commemoration of a sacrifice."[103] But it is clear that indeed there was a dispute on the matter of whether the body and blood of Christ were received or even present in the Supper. In his _Amica Exegesis_ of March 1526, Zwingli attempted to deal with Luther's objections to his doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Luther, as we have seen, maintained the corporal presence. Zwingli replied, "If Christ is corporeally in the Last Supper, the elect are also. It is surprising that those who eat Christ do not recoil in terror from this Christbearer who outdoes the colossus of Rhodes." The body of Christ cannot be present, argues Zwingli; for the body of Christ is at the right hand of the Father.[104]

---

[102] _Ibid_., p. 133.

[103] Barclay, _Protestant Doctrine_, p. 45. Barclay employs such citations in his attempt to show the similarity of the doctrines of the major reformers.

Zwingli's contention against the physical presence very much depends on his denial of the concept of the ubiquity of the body of Christ. The creed states explicitly that Christ ascended into heaven and sits at the right hand of the Father. The Romans must abandon their contention for the inclusion of the corporal body of Christ in the elements of the Supper, for it is in the teeth of accepted doctrine.[105] Furthermore, because of the two natures of Christ it must be said on the one hand that the divine nature never left heaven, and on the other that only the human nature ascended.

> If Christ is now seated at the right hand of God, and will sit there until he comes at the last Day, how can he be literally eaten in

---

[104] Rilliet, Zwingli, pp. 228-229.

[105] John Baillie, John T. McNeill, Henry P. Van Dusen, gen. eds., The Library of Christian Classics, Vol. xxiv: Zwingli and Bullinger, ed. G.W. Bromiley (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1953), p. 186. This can easily be contrasted with Luther's repeated assertions that even if the mind rejects the possibility of Christ's presence in many places simultaneously, the christian ought to cleave to the words of Christ.

the Sacrament?[106]

Christ has said, "Me ye have not always with you", and again, "I leave the world".[107]

These sayings clearly refer to Christ's physical presence. How then can he be physically present in the Sacrament? This argument does considerable violence, as Luther and others pointed out, to the unity of the two natures, and thus to the incarnation. But it makes Zwingli's views clear, and clarity is a hallmark of Zwingli.[108]

The dispute at Marburg takes a similar tack. Zwingli pointed out that Christ is always in one place, whether it be the manger, the temple, the desert, on the cross, in the tomb or at the right hand of the Father. Could Luther prove from scripture that he was ever in two places simultaneously?

> It would be disgraceful...to hold to such an article and to teach it while not being able, or not wishing to adduce any scriptural argument in support of it.[109]

---

[106] Ibid., p. 214.

[107] Ibid. Sasse comments:

> Zwingli never denied that the right hand of God is everywhere and that consequently, Christ shares the omnipresence of God. This, however, is true of his divine nature only. His humanity is not in the same way on the right hand of God. Body, p. 148.

[108] Though perhaps Sasse's comment is somewhat misguided, not to say irrelevant:

> For Zwingli clarity was always a mark of the word of God, even if such clarity was reached at the expense of the inexhaustible depth of the divine word.

Ibid., p. 127.

[109] Rilliet, Zwingli, pp. 262-263. At this point

If, therefore, Christ's body could not be present in the elements because that body is present only in heaven, what is one to think of the phrase *Hoc est corpus meum*, this is my body? Zwingli, adducing scripture, argued that "*est*" must mean "*significat*".[110] Similarly, in the Johannine passages referring to Christ as the vine, the good shepherd, the lamb, the seed, etc.;[111] Christ is none of these things in a literal sense. Zwingli applies the conclusions of his discussion of these passages to the words of institution. The "*est*" must be understood figuratively. He argues that if the flesh of Christ were truly in the elements, and if our sense perception means anything, then "in the flesh he is torn apart by the teeth and perceptibly masticated". If the "*est*" of the phrase is to be taken literally, then the body of Christ must be "visibly, corporally,

---

Luther indicated the words "*Hoc est corpus meum*" which he had chalked on the table.

> "My dear sirs", he cried, "as the text of our Lord Jesus Christ is there, *hoc est corpus meum*, I cannot set it at naught, but must confess and believe that the body of Christ is there." "But, doctor," protested Ulrich, "you therefore accept a localization of your body of Christ in the eucharist. You say, 'the body of Christ must be there', and 'there' in truth is an adverb of place." *Ibid*.

[110] e.g., Gen. 41:26, "The seven good cows *are* seven years."; Matt. 11:14, "John the Baptist *was* Elijah."; Ex. 12:26, "It *is* the passing over of the Lord."; John 15:5, "I *am* the vine, you *are* the branches." Cf. Rilliet, *Zwingli*, p. 235.

[111] Bromiley, *Zwingli and Bullinger*, p. 120.

and perceptibly present".[112] Since this is patently not so, Christ is neither transubstantially nor physically present.

"*Est*" actually means "*significat*" in the words of institution. That which is eaten, Zwingli argued, can neither be visible nor corporal. "*Est*" can only mean "*significat*". There is a precedent for this, Zwingli asserted, namely the Paschal Feast. The metaphor of the Lord's Supper corresponds to that of the eating of the paschal lamb. The lamb is

> not a passover, for a passover is "forbearance to smite", whereas a lamb is flesh and blood, etc. Yet God himself says: "It is the passover". Therefore in this context the little word "is" is necessarily figurative, that is, it is used for "signify".[113]

The figurative understanding of the words of institution extends further. Zwingli asserts that the essential point of salvation is belief. Thus the bread is Christ himself, who has come down to earth. "Bread" might then be rendered "Gospel", "eat" by "believe".[114] Such an understanding of the words of scripture was necessitated by Zwingli's radical separation of spirit and flesh. "Many eat and drink sacramentally the body and blood of Christ who however are not in God. Neither is God in them, except to the extent to which he is also in an elephant or in a flea." It is the Spirit of God, not the flesh of the Supper, which gives life. The flesh avails nothing. "There is nothing", declares Zwingli, "so absurd as the conviction of eating 'spiritually his carnal body'. The very words clash with each other and are mutually exclusive."[114]

---

[112] *Ibid*. Zwingli means this argument to be directed against Luther. Yet we have already seen that Luther rejected this eating as Capernaite, cf. above, pp.97-98.

[113] Bromiley, *Zwingli and Bullinger*, p. 225. Cf. Van De Poll, *Ideas*, where it is noted that Bucer and Luther criticized Zwingli for his materialistic conconception of God. According to this premise, they said, Zwingli could not allow the simultaneous presence of the divine and the creaturely. "*Est*" can only mean "*significat*" on this presupposition.

The central point of true teaching is faith for Zwingli. Without faith no thought or activity is acceptable as good or true. So far as the relationship between the Sacrament of the Altar and faith was concerned, the Sacrament was a physical activity which was thought of as an *initiatio* or *oppignatio*--a pledge of faith. The Sacrament itself could not affect the inward man. Only faith could do this. "If faith", says Zwingli, " is complete only when it is confirmed by a sign, then it is not faith." The efficacy of the Sacrament lies in faith, as does the efficacy of all religious acts.

To eat Christ means to have faith. To support this argument Zwingli marshals the evidence of John 6, the discourse on the eating of Christ. The true bread is that which has descended from the father in heaven:

---

[114] Rilliet, *Zwingli*, pp. 115-116. If the depth of the rift between Luther and Zwingli has not been demonstrated hitherto, surely the abyss between Luther's concept of the Flesh-Spirit dichotomy and Zwingli's will make the point.

> Panis iste est, qui de caelo descendit, ut qui ex eo edat non moriatur.... Qui vero hanc panem manducat, ne scilicet, hoc est; qui me credit, habet vitam aeternam.[115]

Zwingli believed that faith was the total response of man to the work of Christ. It was being grasped by God through the Holy Spirit. It is also a thing (res) and not a mere flight of fancy, an opinion or a thought.[116] Faith is not mere consciousness, but a gift of God, whereby men are "restored from despair to the transcendant realm of forgiveness and hope".[117] If, then, true belief is a relationship of faith, and thus primarily a conscious thing, the elements and the substance of Christ's body have little relevance. The elements are picturesque ways of expressing a relationship of faith, i.e. *oppignatio*.[118]

McDonnell suggests that the "lordly role of faith" for Zwingli makes it impossible for him to consider a " positive understanding" of the Sacrament. Faith is the summum bonum of religion--it has no competitors. Zwingli wrote to Wyttenbach in 1523, "Think of it this way; you eat the Eucharist there where faith is."[119]

---

[115] *Corpus Reformatorum*, Vol. XC: *Huldreich Zwinglis Sämtliche Werke*, eds. Emil Egli, et. al. (Leipzig: Verlag von M. Heinlus Nachfolgt, 1914), Band III, p. 777, cf. p. 779 and p. 781:

> Et est quarta nota, qua perspicatur Christum hic de sacramentali esu non loqui; sed de esu fidei: Qui enim credit se traditione Christi liberatum, et sanguinis eius effusione ablutum, is haud dubie in Deo manet.

[116] C. C. Richardson, *Zwingli and Cranmer on the Eucharist (Cranmer Dixit et Contradixit)* (Evanston: Seabury-Western, 1949), p. 6.

[117] *Ibid*., p.8.

[118] *Ibid*., pp. 13ff.

Can we then speak of a belief in a spiritual presence for Zwingli? If so, can he be said to believe that such a presence is unique in the Sacrament, i.e. in some way related uniquely to the elements? Bromiley states that Zwingli does not dispute that Christ is truly present in the Supper. What he disputs is that Christ is substantially present in the substance of his flesh and blood, present after his human nature.[120]

Richardson[121] suggests that Christ is present by divinity, according to Zwingli, not by humanity, and this presence is immediately grasped by the faithful heart. No channel of grace is therefore necessary, for the presence is seized directly by faith. This presence according to divinity was what Zwingli meant by his teaching of the spiritual presence. For it was the nature of the divine to be omnipresent; and to the believer "who holds him in his soul like a treasure" Christ is peculiarly present by his divinity, power and goodness.[122]

---

[119] McDonnell, Calvin, p. 90. Also note the argument that Zwingli is not concerned with the denial "that the body is present in faith. Rather he denies that its undoubted presence renders it profitable. That is why the whole eucharistic dispute is such an expasperating waste of energy: 'The flesh profits nothing; why therefore dispute about the flesh?'" Ibid., p. 92, and cf. Rilliet, Zwingli, p. 253.

[120] Bromiley, Zwingli and Bullinger, p. 183. Bromiley goes on to suggest that"the activity of God is not only linked with the spiritual presence of Christ in the Supper, but with the operation of the Holy Spirit. Here Zwingli and the ex opera operato doctrine...mesh, for in emphasizing the internal ministry of the Holy Spirit, they both stress the divine transcendence and sovereignty." Ibid.

[121] Richardson, Cranmer and Zwingli, p. 16.

Bromiley and Richardson both accept a spiritual presence in Zwingli. Bromiley appears to see Zwingli as linking the elements to the spiritual presence, thus rendering the Supper a unique form of the presence, though controlled by faith. Richardson denies that channels of grace are necessary according to Zwingli, and appears to come down against any unique link between the elements and the spiritual presence.

That there is a spiritual presence linked with the elements appears to be true for Zwingli. He declared,

> The whole community shares in the body of Christ. We are the community of the body and blood of Christ. For when you offer thanks for the Cup and Bread, eating and drinking together, you signify thereby that you are one body and one bread, namely the body which is the church of Christ; which in this Sacrament confesses its faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, who gave his body and blood on our behalf.

On the other hand, one cannot say that those who participate in the Sacrament without faith eat sacramentally. For in such unworthy participation, they call down upon themselves the wrath of judgment and divine punishment. They dishonor the body of Christ, that is, the whole mystery of the incarnation and passion, as well as the church of Christ.[123] There is a doctrine of the spiritual presence linked to the elements in Zwingli, one which is seen in the context of communion. But faith is the controlling factor on the matter of the efficacy of the Supper, i.e. the communion. The primary role of faith does not necessarily prevent a link between the elements and the spiritual presence.

---

[122] *Ibid*.

It therefore seems correct to see in Zwingli a belief in the spiritual presence which is linked to the Supper; though it is also correct to note that it is the faith of the believer which controls that link. Thus we may agree with Richardson and say that Zwingli did not assent to the Sacrament as an external channel of grace. On the other hand, it is not necessary for us to deny a link between the spiritual presence and the elements, for this is understood in terms of communion of the body of Christ which is the church. The _communio_ of the church is a result of the unique link of the spiritual presence to the elements.

The debate on the matter of the "mere memorialism" of Zwingli has been a warm one. On the one side are those who wish to preserve the Reformed tradition as one which held the Sacraments in high regard, and thus find Zwingli innocent of the charge of "mere memorialism". Those who level that charge, on the other hand, usually find Zwingli difficult to squeeze into their conception of what the "Sacraments duly performed" phrase ought to mean. The greater the distance between their theories and Zwingli the better.

---

[123] Bromiley, _Zwingli and Bullinger_, _An Exposition of the Faith_, pp. 259-260.

Consider on the one side Barclay's contention that when all the dust had settled, Zwingli, Luther, Calvin, and Ratramnus had a great deal in common, and this ought to be recognized for the sake of church unity.[124] Thus we are not surprised to find that Zwingli is opposed to "mere memorialism". Indeed, Zwingli passed through three carefully defined stages. The first was the period in which he contended with the defenders of the Roman view. During the second he fought with Luther; and during the third, under the influence of the mediating Bucer, he returned to the "more positive views he held at the outset". [125]

McDonnell, however, asserts that Zwingli tended to "confuse the means of grace with the sacramental flag of the reformation, opus operatum, and he confuses the real corporal presence of Christ in the Eucharist with a crass physical presence."[126]

He is taken further into a simply symbolical, merely memorial classification by Innes, who, in contrasting Zwingli with Luther, asserts that the Sacrament was a "purely commemorative ordinance". [127] Yet another push is given by Heman, in his argument for the significance of the Sacrament for Luther (and Lutherans). He states that Zwingli was a pure symbolist. The bread and wine are signa nuda of the spiritual unity of believers with Christ. This unity is symbolized in the Supper. There is nothing but commemoration in the Supper from Zwingli's point of view.[128]

---

[124] Barclay, Protestant Doctrine. [125] Ibid., p.43.

[126] McDonnell, Calvin, p. 92. To adjudge Zwingli as "confused" may be the prerogative of a theologian. McDonnell seems to think that Zwingli hadn't got it quite right.

Bishop Brilioth asserts that Zwingli's view is "in an almost defiant way purely symbolistic".[129]

Both groups appear to be doing Zwingli a disservice: The attempt to place Zwingli in one or another of the available sacramental camps seems to deny him the right of affirming a link between the elements and the presence, and the assertion of faith as the controlling concept in all matters of religious life at the same time. Zwingli's scholars appear unable to accept one aspect without denying the other. This is unfortunate, in view of what appears to be a distortion of Zwingli's understanding of the Supper which arises out of this controversy. It seems more just to allow him to affirm both elements, contradictory as they may appear to be by present standards of Eucharistic theology.

---

[127] Innes, Cranmer, p. 115.

[128] R. Heman, Mysterium Sanctum Magnum (Lucerne: Verlag Räber & Cie., 1937), p. 30.

[129] Yngve Brilioth, Eucharistic Faith and Practice: Evangelical and Catholic, trans. A. G. Hebert (London: SPCK, 1956), p. 156. Brilioth seems to entertain a dim view of Zwingli's teaching, especially the almost total absence of the element of mystery in his concept of the Eucharist: a concept quite dear to Brilioth, cf. pp. 157, 160, et passim.

Luther and Zwingli have been discussed together in this section because of their historical relationship. This relationship culminated in the Marburg Colloquy, so far as the question of the presence of Christ in the Eucharist was concerned. That this dispute was crucial for the future of Protestantism seems clear. The question of the presence split the protestant party not only badly but openly in October 1529.[130] That the split was based on the inability of Luther, Zwingli, and their followers to agree on the matter of the presence is also clear from the report of the conclusions coming out of the conference. Agreement was reached on doctrines of the trinity, incarnation, the unity of the two natures, original sin, redemption by faith in the sacrifice of Christ, the nature of faith, the futility of the doctrine of works and merit, the uselessness of monastic vows, the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, of Baptism, good works, confession of sin, and the repudiation of human traditions and accretions. Rilliet notes that even on the matter of communion some agreement was reached, on "communion in both kinds, repudiation of the mass regarded as a work deserving of grace, recognition of the rite instituted by Christ as a sacrament", and the necessity for every true christian to participate spiritually in the body and blood of Christ.[131]

---

[130] For the pre-history of Marburg, see Luther's Works, Vo. 37, pp. xi-xv, 153, and Grimm, Reformation, pp. 194-195.

The differences were stated thus:

> Although we have been unable to agree on the issue as to whether the true vine and blood of Christ are corporeally present in the bread and wine of the Eucharist, nevertheless each party will prove towards the other its spirit of Christian love, in so far as his conscience will permit.

The signers were Luther, Jonas, Melanchthon, Osiander, and Brenz on the Lutheran side, Oecolampadius, Zwingli, Bucer, and Hedion on the opposite side.[132]

The differences between Zwingli and Luther are held by some to have been irreconcilable. Van De Poll believes that this was due to Zwingli's "dualism", i.e. his radical separation of flesh and spirit.[133] Sasse lays the blame squarely on Zwingli.[134]

---

[131] Rilliet, Zwingli, p. 265. [132] Ibid.

[133] Van De Poll, Ideas, pp. 85-86. Luther, in That These Words, stated: "It is perfectly clear, of course, that we are at odds concerning the words of Christ in the Supper." Luther's Works, Vol. 37, p. 25.

[134] "Thus Zwingli, certainly against his own will, through his spirit of understanding the Gospel, assisted more than anyone in the destruction of the Sacrament in the Protestant world." Sasse, Body, p. 130. Perhaps this is not so much an anti-Zwingli statement as a pro-Sacramental statement.

Hillerbrand, in his summary of the Colloquy, asserts that the "theological differences were simply too great". Luther's attitude made it clear from the very beginning that "agreement" meant the surrender of his opponents.[135] Thus he chalked the words "*Hoc est corpus meum*" on the table before the discussion even began in earnest.[136] Peters notes radical differences between Luther and Zwingli on the matters of the related concepts of ubiquity and the presence of God in all creatures.[137] Harbison states that the Reformers came in 1529 to "an irreconcilable disagreement on whether Christ was truly present in the Sacrament of the Holy Communion or not."[138] Rillietsums up the differences of Luther and Zwingli, from the beginning of their early writings, as based on Zwingli's stress on the "subjective element in communion", while Luther remains convinced that the means chosen by Christ convey "objective grace".[139] Fischer similarly places them at a considerable distance apart on the matters of the interpretation of scripture and the question of ubiquity.[140]

---

[135] Hillerbrand, *Reformation*, p. 108.

[136] Hillerbrand notes also that "the failure to reach theological agreement was for Zürich and Zwingli politically disastrous. When at the Diet of Augsburg the following year Zwingli ventured, like the Lutherans, to present a confession of faith, it was not accepted. The Emperor made it clear that he would not even talk with the Swiss." *Ibid*. p. [illegible].

Note summaries of the differences between Luther and Zwingli: (1) with an eye to reconciling them on major points, Barclay, *Protestant Doctrine*, pp. 84-85; and (2) a very accurate and lucid summary in *Luther's Works*, Vol. 37, pp. xviii-xix.

[137] Peters, *Realpräsenz*, pp. 75, 92.

[138] E. Harris Harbison, *The Age of Reformation* (Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1955), p. 60; and cf. Grimm, *Reformation*, pp. 196-197 for a similar understanding.

On the other hand there have been those who do not see such a great gap between the two. Some stress how near Lutherans and Zwinglians came to agreement at Marburg. Bainton comments that the measure of agreement reached at Marburg was surprising. The one point of discord was the Supper. Yet even here the degree of concurrence was remarkable. While Luther insisted on the physical presence of the body and blood in the Supper, he was willing to concede that the Sacrament was of no value without faith. On the other side, Zwingli agreed that there was more to the Supper than commemoration, for a spiritual communion of Christ was effected. The Lutheran proposal for concord was rejected by the Swiss only because it did not make an explicit statement affirming only a spiritual presence.[141]

Both the Lutherans and the Zwinglians believed

---

[139] Rilliet, Zwingli, pp. 220-221. He further notes that Zwingli's "Nestorianism" and Luther's "Monophysitism" demonsrate the width of the gap between them.

[140] Bainton Festschrift, "A Reasonable Luther", by Robert H. Fischer, pp. 42-45.

[141] Bainton, Reformation, p. 92.

Christ to be truly present in the Supper, writes Köhler. The difference was one of minimal importance, i.e. subjective against objective presence. In the end they agreed that Christ was present "*substantialiter et essentialiter*". Köhler questions the difference between "*realiter*" and "*vere*", employed as they were by opposing sides. His conclusion: "Wozu der Streit?"[142]

Finally, Barclay maintains that Calvin's doctrine is an outgrowth of Zwingli's.[143] Further, Calvin and Luther are basically agreed on the following questions: (1)the concept of the nature of the heavenly gift given to communicants; (2) the more or less equal efficacy of the word alone and the word of the Sacrament; (3) the objective nature of the Sacrament; and (4) opposition to communion of the unworthy, though this must be so severly qualified as to weaken the agreement considerably. Generally, notes Barclay, Calvin and Luther have the same view of substance.[144] The logical conclusion of such an argument is that Zwingli and Luther are really not so very far distant. There is, in other words, argues Barclay, a genuine Protestant Doctrine of the Eucharist. The three Reformers are basically in agreement. There is underlying unity; and there is no gain in pushing the differences to the fore in light of this unity.

---

[142] Köhler, *Luther und Zwingli*, II, pp. 523-524.

[143] Barclay, *Protestant Doctrine*, p. 228.

[144] *Ibid*., pp. 232ff.

It is difficult to accept the attempts at amelioration. It may seem to Barclay, Köhler, *et. al*. that the differences are not so great. But this argument stems from their view of what the Sacrament is. Köhler argues that any agreement on the presence of Christ ought to be the end of the controversy. Bainton appears to have understated the importance of a right doctrine of the Eucharist to both Luther and Zwingli, in his attempt to show how close they had come. Barclay seems to be pushing for unity of a very sketchy nature indeed. The differences between Luther and Zwingli, regardless of how small they may seem to historians of the sacramental controversy themselves, were quite obviously crucial differences to Luther and Zwingli. When Protestantism was in a very dangerous position indeed, the disagreement on this matter remained. Attempts to bring Luther and Zwingli together over their dead bodies fail as Bucer's attempts failed. The differences were centered on an issue vital to both Reformers. Not even for the sake of unity would they dismiss them.

Our major concern here, however, has been to set forth the teachings of Luther and Zwingli on the matter of the presence of Christ in the Supper. In so doing, it is hoped that a comprehensive groundwork will have been laid for our future consideration of the question of the relationship between English and Continental Eucharistic doctrines of the Reformers.

Calvin and Bullinger: the Consensus Tigurinus

With the following discussion of the writings of Calvin in the matter of the presence of Christ in the Supper, we move into the period of the Continental Reformation contemporary with that of the English Reformation.[1] This is not to say, of course, that the influence of Luther, Zwingli, and their followers may be straightway discounted. Rather, one finds in this later period attempts to consolidate and crystallize the first efforts of the Protestant movement. That Calvin should produce such a systematic statement as the Institutes between the years 1536 and 1559 is a fact not unrelated to that of a period of consolidation.

Wendel notes that "the increasing importance that Calvin himself attached to the question of the Lord's Supper...can be measured by the greater and greater space alloted to it in the successive editions of the Institutes."[2]

---

[1] It is intended that this examination of the Continental Eucharistic debate continue with Calvin, although Bucer precedes him chronologically and possibly also in terms of doctrine, i.e. Calvin's experience in Strassburg doubtless influenced his Eucharistic doctrine to some extent. However, as it will be suggested that we find close proximity in the views of Bucer, Calvin, Bullinger, and Martyr if we adopt Calvinistic categories, we shall begin with Calvin.

[2] François Wendel, Calvin, trans. Philip Mairet (London: Collins, 1963), p. 330.

At first, he was most concerned with refuting the Roman doctrine of the Eucharist. By 1559, however, the whole of one chapter (Book IV, xvii) is concerned with the Lord's Supper. On the other hand, it should be noted, with McDonnell, that while greater space was allotted to this issue of the Supper, it is generally agreed that the doctrine he taught did not alter greatly.[3]

It is not the intention here to delve into the sources of Calvin's Eucharistic doctrine. McDonnell summarizes his interesting treatment of this question in a list of early, middle, and late medieval Fathers on whom Calvin is to some degree dependent. Augustine heads the list.[4] Augustine is invoked by Calvin, for example, in the latter's rejection of the strict localization of the body of Christ in heaven, and the direct relation of the symbol of the Supper to the flesh of Christ. Augustine's teaching is seen in Calvin's confutation of Westphal's assertion of the manducatio impiorum, and Calvin's counter-argument that the unworthy receive only the naked elements.[5]

---

[3] McDonnell, Calvin: "It is universally acknowledged among Calvin researchers that there is little development in his Eucharistic doctrine." p. 3.

[4] Ibid., pp. 58-59. Others are Isidore of Seville, Humbert of Silva Candida, Paschasius Radbertus, Rabanus Marus, the irrespressible Ratramnus, Berengarius, Wycliffe, and Hus.

[5] Ibid. , p. 44. Note also McDonnell's argument for a common ground in rejecting monophysitic tendencies, p. 42, and a common conclusion that "the fruit of the Eucharist is above all mutual charity", p. 41.

We begin this statement of Calvin's Eucharistic doctrine with his understanding of the function of the elements. Calvin notes that the bread and wine are signs of the body and blood of Christ:

> Maintenant, si on demande à savoir, néanmoins, si le pain est le corps de Christ, et le vin son sang, nous répondrons que le pain et le sang sont signes visibles, lesquels nous représentent le corps et le sang.[6]

But they are not merely signs, nor bare signs:

> mais que ce nom et titre de corps et de sang leur est attribué, pource que ce sont comme instruments par lesquels le Seigneur Jésus nous les distribue.[7]

The elements of the Supper act as the dove in the baptism: that is, like the dove they are signs, but powerful signs.

> Ainsi en est-il de la communication que nous avons au corps et au sang du Seigneur Jésus. C'est un mystère spirituel, lequel ne peut se voir à l'oeil, ne comprendre en l'entendement humain.[8]

The mystery of the presence of Christ in the Supper is spiritual, and is beyond human comprehension; yet the presence is not to be doubted. The elements are joined to the body of Christ as signs of his promises. These elements are not, then, bare signs, but joined to the truth and substance of Christ himself. It is therefore appropriate that the bread is called the body, for the body is not only represented but also present in the bread. Thus the name of the thing signified is transferred to that which signifies it, i.e. the bread is called the body of Christ, the wine his blood. But it should be recalled that the Sacrament is not separate from the truth and substance of Christ.[9]

---

[6] Schmidt, *Oeuvres*, II, pp. 110-111

[7] *Ibid*. [8] *Ibid*.

The signs, by no means unrelated to the body of Christ, are promises. The words of institution, for Calvin as for Luther, stand behind the elements, giving the Supper its meaning.

> It is not, therefore, the chief function of the Sacrament simply and without higher consideration to extend to us the body of Christ. Rather, it is to seal and confirm that promise by which he testifies that his flesh is food indeed and his blood is drink, which feed us unto eternal life.[10]

Calvin justifies McDonnell's conclusion in the *Petit Traite de la Sainte Cene de Notre Seigneur Jesus-Christ....*[11]

> Pour cette cause j'ai coûtume de dire que la matière et substance des sacrements, c'est le Seigneur Jésus: l'efficace, sont les grâces et bénédictions que nous avons par son moyen. Or, l'efficace de la Cène est de nous confermer la reconciliation que nous avons avec Dieu par sa mort et passion: le lavement de nos âmes que nous avons en l'effusion de son sang: la

---

[9] *Ibid*.

[10] John Baillie, John T. McNeill, Henry P. Van Dusen, gen. eds., *The Library of Christian Classics*, Vols. XX-XXI: *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, John Calvin, trans. F. L. Battles (2 vols.; London: S. C. M. Press, 1961), II, p. 1363.

[11] Hereafter, *Petit Traite*. Schmidt, *Oeuvres*, II, p. 109.

> justice que nous avons en son obéissance: bref, l'esperance de salut que nous avons en tout ce qu'il a fait pour nous.

The flesh of Christ in the Sacrament may also be "life-giving". It " does not of itself have a power so great as to quicken us, for in its first condition it was subject to mortality; and now, endowed with immortality, it does not live through itself. Nevertheless, since it is pervaded with fullness of life to be transmitted to us, it is rightly called 'life-giving'."[12]

The Supper is a visible witness of the promise of John 6, where Jesus calls himself the bread of life come from heaven. Thus visible bread serves as an intermediary to represent that spiritual bread. Without both we lose all benefit which God has chosen to confer upon us.[13] God gives us signs which encourage us in our reliance upon his promises. The signs of bread and wine,

> which represent for us the invisible food that we receive from the flesh and blood of Christ,

show us that God discharges

> the function of a provident householder in continually supplying to us the food to sustain and preserve us in that life into which he has begotten us by his Word.[14]

Calvin repeatedly emphasises the point that the body and blood of Christ are really present. We shall have occasion to discuss his use of realistic terminology later. Though he clearly asserts that the sacramental mode of expression must be understood figuratively,[15] this is not to say that the body of Christ is not received.[16]

---

[12] Battles, Institutes, II, p. 1369.

[13] Ibid., p. 1376.

[14] Ibid., p. 1360.

> We believe...that both in baptism and the Lord's Supper, God in reality bestows on us and accomplishes by effect what is there symbolized, and moreover we receive with the signs the real possession and enjoyment of what is there presented to us. And thus it is that those who bring to the sacred table of Jesus Christ a pure faith, as it were a vessel, receive what the symbols represent.

The Petit Traité makes a similar point: "Jesus Christ nous y soit donné comme substance et fondement de tout...nous mangeons le pain...en signe que sa chair nous est viande...."[17]

A fuller statement of Calvin's argument for the importance of the relationship between the signs of the Supper and the promises of God is seen in the Institutes. To make the elements an empty sign is to deny the sovereignty of God, in that one thus also denies the fulfillment of his promise. What is promised, i.e. the body and blood of Christ, must be present in the Supper. The present distribution of the body and blood of the Lord would not greatly benefit us unless they had once for all been given for our redemption and salvation. They are therefore represented under bread and wine so that we may learn not only that they are ours but that they have been destined as food for our spiritual life. Thus spiritual understanding is approached by means of the physical elements in the Supper. The bread is a symbol of Christ's body; and thus we understand that as the bread nourishes our bodies, so Christ's body is the only sustenance to invigorate and feed our soul. Similarly, as wine refreshes the body so the blood of Christ imparts spiritual benefits to our soul. If we consider, upon reception, the benefits of the giving of Christ's body and blood, we shall immediately comprehend that the qualities of bread and wine are well adapted to their function of expressing the giving of Christ's benefits.[18]

---

[15] McDonnell, Calvin, p. 228. [16] Ibid.

[17] Van De Poll, Ideas, p. 88.

It seems clear, then, that Calvin's concern for the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Supper is based on a concern for the efficacy and reality of the promises which are the elements, the signs which are the bread and wine. Sucn concern forced him to oppose the Roman teaching of transubstantiation. Transubstantiation destroyed the tension between the sign and the thing signified--which tension Calvin apparently thought essential to a true signification of God's promises. Augustine taught that the words "body" and "blood" cannot be understood completely literally. Calvin's opponents had misunderstood

---

[18] Battles, Institutes, pp. 1362-1363. Cf. Van De Poll, Ideas, p. 87: "To Calvin the elements remain also mere seals of the promise; a 'conversio' does take place, but in a spiritual sense and in virtue of the promise." This does not really do justice to Calvin's concern for the real presence.

Augustine on this matter. For he calls the body of the Supper

> either eucharist, or sacrament of the body. But we need not seek in a long roundabout way the sense in which he uses the words "flesh" and "blood", since he explains himself, saying that sacraments take their names from their likeness to the signs they signify; consequently, in a certain sense, the sacrament of the body is the body.[19]

The dispute over the meaning of Augustine's understanding of the presence indicates Calvin's dislike for the concept of the presence of the sacrificial victim of the cross in the Supper.[20] In transubstantiation, the sign is destroyed. Remove the sign, argues Calvin, and you remove the instrument of the promise: "In the Supper the flesh of Christ is not truly and fittingly promised to us to be truly food unless the true substance of the outward symbol corresponds to it."[21]

---

[19] Battles, Institutes, II, p. 1396.

[20] Note Calvin's opposition to the concept of the sacrifice in the mass, ibid., pp. 1429ff., and cf. McDonnell, Calvin, pp. 137-138.

[21] Ibid., pp. 229-230. McDonnell argues that Calvin believed that the only reality of the Supper was the presence of both the body and blood and the signs, though not in the fashion of Luther. If transubstantiation occurs, then the bread and wine are only accidents without substance--there is no reality. The Sacrament "which is only a shadow cannot sign reality and cannot give reality. Only when the bread remains is there a correspondence between the sign and its reality. The Romans, by their doctrine of transubstantiation, have destroyed the symbol, and they have thereby destroyed the reality. Without the reality of the sacrament you have no real presence, and therefore transubstantiation is a denial of the real presence." Ibid. This seems to be a very fair statement of Calvin's strong stand on the reality of the signs,

The question before us, then, is that of the relationship of the elements to the body. That they are indeed related seems clear at this point. Furthermore, a literal understanding of the presence of the body seems impossible with Calvin, in view of the nature of his rejection of transubstantiation. Sasse suggests that for Calvin only the soul of the believer receives the body and blood simultaneously.[22] We shall allow Calvin to augment this simplistic statement. From the *Institutes*, we note this assertion:

> ...the Sacrament does not cause Christ to begin to be the bread of life; but when it reminds us that he was made the bread of life, which we continually eat, and which gives us a relish and savor of that bread, it causes us to feel the power of that bread.... Christ beautifully expresses the whole matter in these words: "The bread which I shall give you is my flesh, which I shall give for the life of the world". By these words he doubtless means that his body will to us be as bread for the spiritual life of the soul, for it was to be made subject to death for our salvation; moreover, that it is offered to us to eat, when it makes us sharers in him by faith.[23]

The body is received, then, in faith. Faith is, indeed, essential to the reception of the body and blood of Christ. Calvin thus stresses the necessity of faith

---

while it also does justice to his commitment to the need for the presence in the Supper. See also McDonnell's argument for Calvin's "platonic tension" between the sign and the thing signified. Without both, there is no Eucharistic reality, and the image and the truth are confused, p. 231.

[22] Sasse, *Body*, p. 328. Hence the *manducatio oralis* and *manducatio impiorum* or *indignorum* are impossible.

[23] Battles, *Institutes*, II, p. 1364.

in the Supper as a subjective controlling element in the participation in the true body and blood of Christ. It is clearly a distinctive feature of his concept of the real presence.

What is the position of the elements if this is true? [24] Calvin rejects a local presence out of hand:

> And first we must not dream of such a presence of Christ in the Sacrament as the craftsmen of the Roman Court have fashioned--as if the body of Christ, by a local presence, were put there to be touched by the hands, to be chewed by the teeth, and to be swallowed by the mouth.[25]

Transubstantiation, the attempt to explain the local presence, is called "that monster". Calvin considered the defenders of the doctrine equally crude in methodology and conclusion. Transubstantiation meant to Calvin a "naturalization" of God in the bread. Thus bread in the Supper comes to be taken for God. God has thus been reduced to an object which can be manipulated. God, Calvin declares, is always subject, never object;

---

[24] Note McDonnell's thorough discussion of possible points of juncture between Scotist theories of concomitance "of the action of the Holy Spirit and of the reception of the eucharistic elements", pp. 11-12; and note also the suggestion that Calvin learned from Occam and nominalism the idea that "the believer is put into contact with Christ and the sacramental elements in a simultaneous but separate fashion", p. 22.

[25] Battles, Institutes, p. 1372. Calvin, incidentally, feels that from this belief in the local presence "proceeds that fictitious transubstantiation for which today they [the Roman Church] fight more bitterly than for all the other articles of their faith." Ibid., p. 1374.

"It is intolerable blasphemy to declare literally of an ephemeral and corruptible element that it is Christ."[26] Calvin sought a presence of God in Christ in the Supper. The making of God in the elements denied such a presence. It was the act of men making God in their own image.[27]

Briefly, Calvin opposes the Roman teaching of the local presence and transubstantiation because they make dangerous inroads on the sovereignty of God and the unique mode of being of God in Christ. The reduction of Christ to bread is blasphemous nonsense. The reality of the Supper depends on the bread and wine remaining bread and wine. If they do not, they are not signs. If they are not signs, they are not Sacraments. If they are only the body and blood of Christ, it is not God's but man's work we believe in.[28]

Calvin opposes the scholastic argument for the presence of Christ hidden under the appearance of the bread because it does not conform with true faith. Though the schoolmen may argue that "Christ is not there contained in any circumscripture or bodily fashion", their position comes down to this: "that Christ is to be sought in what they call 'species of bread.'"

---

[26] McDonnell, Calvin, pp. 119ff.

[27] Cf. Schmidt, Oeuvres, II, pp. 127ff.

[28] Note McDonnell's argument for platonism in Calvin's concept of participation, and in his assertion of the tension between the heavenly reality and the earthly sign. Calvin, pp. 36-37.

> But whatever words they introduce to disguise it, this is the purpose of them all: through consecration what was previously bread is made Christ, so that thereupon Christ lies hidden under the appearance of bread.... They are little concerned about true faith by which alone we attain fellowship with Christ and cleave to him. Provided they have a physical presence of him, which they have fabricated apart from God's word, they think that they have presence enough.[29]

Neither would Calvin accept Luther's teaching on the identification of the elements with the body and blood of Christ. Calvin understood Luther to be directing the words of Consecration, "Hoc est corpus meum", to the bread, and not to believers. The words were a proclamation to his disciples at the Last Supper--Christ was not speaking to the bread.[30] Calvin opposed those who hid in the words for their defence of the identification of the elements and the body and blood. "Hearing Christ's words, 'This is my body', they imagine a miracle, far from his mind."

> But when foul absurdities come forth from this fiction, because they have already with headlong haste ensnared themselves, they plunge into the abyss of God's omnipotence to extinguish by this means the light of truth.

With "haughty fastidiousness" they take refuge in the word of God. Calvin is also concerned to find a sound understanding of this passage, but without "perverted ardor" which rashly siezes that which first springs to mind. "Rather, after diligently meditating upon it, we embrace the meaning which the Spirit of God offers."[31]

---

[29] Battles, Institutes, II, pp. 1373-1374.

[30] Cf. McDonnell, Calvin, p. 64.

[31] Battles, Institutes, II, p. 1392.

The position which Luther held against all comers is readily apparent here. Though Calvin by no means wishes to repress all sacramental realism, as we shall see, he will not accept a doctrine of *Deus corporeus*. Such a concept detracts seriously in his view from the eschatological hope which plays a large part in his theology.[32] That is to say, if Christ is present corporally in the Supper, what is the point of hoping for his return in the last days? Such an understanding of the presence "anticipates the *eschaton* and therefore destroys the hope of resurrection."[33]

Calvin is furthermore not in agreement with the opposite end of the spectrum. "There are some", he explains, "who define the eating of Christ's flesh and the drinking of his blood as, in one word, nothing but to believe in Christ. But it seems to me that Christ meant to teach something more definite, and more elevated,.... It is that we are quickened by the true partaking of him; and he has therefore designated this partaking by the words 'eating' and 'drinking', in order that one should think that the life that we receive from him is received by mere knowledge."[34]

He recognizes a difference between his teaching and theirs, though he is agreed that the *Deus corporeus* is clearly a false concept. In receiving the elements, one eats in faith. Christ's flesh is made ours in believing. Thus the difference between the memorialist position and Calvin's is this: "I say that we eat Christ's flesh in believing, because it is made ours by faith, and that this eating is the result and effect of faith." For the other part, to eat is to believe. The difference is greater than it seems, argues Calvin. Christ called himself " the Bread of Life"; but by these words he did not mean merely that salvation rests on faith in his death and resurrection. He also meant that "by true partaking of him life passes into us and is made ours", just as bread passes into our bodies and imparts life.[35]

---

[32] Cf. McDonnell, *Calvin*, p. 69. [33] *Ibid*.

[34] Battles, *Institutes*, II, p. 1365.

This distinction which Calvin draws between eating as the equivalent of faith, and faith as the fruit of eating, does not appear to imply the mutual exclusion of faith and eating. He appears to be stressing the need for avoiding a purely intellectual idea of faith, i.e. faith as knowledge, or a body of knowledge.[36] Faith is the vessel, Calvin argues, in which the believer bears away the experience of the Supper. He will even dispute the conclusion of those who say that "the flesh of Christ, although it be without taste, is nonetheless flesh. But I deny that it can be eaten without some taste of flesh." He explains this extraordinary statement thus:

---

[35] _Ibid_.

[36] McDonnell, _Calvin_, p. 178.

> Or (if we prefer to speak as Augustine does), I hold that men bear away from this Sacrament no more than they gather with the vessel of faith. Thus nothing is taken away from the Sacrament; indeed, its truth and effectiveness remain undiminished, although the wicked go away empty after outward participation in it.[37]

Calvin declares,

> I say then that in the Supper, Jesus Christ truly is given to us, under the signs of bread and the wine, nay even his body and his blood in which he fulfilled all righteousness to win salvation for us. And that this is done, firstly, so that we might be united in one body; secondly, so that, being made partakers of his substance we should also feel his virtue, by communicating his benefits to all.[38]

This definition corresponds with that given in the Confession of Faith in the Eucharist of 1537 and the Petit Traité of 1541. He adhered to it constantly thereafter.[39] Yet the efficacy of this participation in Christ, and the presence of the body under the signs of bread and wine, are predicated on the word.

> Of what use should it be to us to eat a little piece of bread and drink three drops of wine,

---

[37] Battles, Institutes, II, pp. 1406-1407. The question of participation in the body of Christ is naturally linked with the question of union with Christ, a point repeatedly made by Calvin. McDonnell notes that when Calvin speaks of the Eucharist he will say that we are united to the substance of his flesh and blood, and when speaking of the union through faith he says simply that we are united to the substance of Christ. Cf. Calvin, p. 180, 185-186.

[38] Wendel, Calvin, p. 336.

[39] Ibid.

> if that voice were not sounding from on high, saying that the flesh of Jesus Christ is the true food of our souls and his blood their true spiritual drink?

We have every right to conclude that it is not through the bread and wine alone that we are made partakers of the flesh and blood of Christ, but through the promise which adheres to them. He gives himself to us, and we receive him by faith. The promise of the signs, and of that which is signified, are both fulfilled.[40]

The importance of the promises of Christ as they are presented and supported in the Lord's Supper is all-pervasive for Calvin. We have seen that he rejects the Roman and Lutheran concepts of the presence of Christ because they do not allow the signs to be true signs, true promises. He rejects also the opposite view, that to eat is to believe, to have faith, for this endangers the reality of the presence, and the fulfillment of God's promise that the signs are not empty and show forth his promises. Without an appreciation of Calvin's stress on the elements as signs and promises, it is impossible to appreciate what otherwise appears to be a self-contradictory position. The promises must be real--therefore both the sign and the thing signified must be real. Otherwise, the promise is not supported. Such a conclusion was wholly untenable for Calvin. Brilioth argues that, indeed, we have no mere sign here. The "matter and substance" of the Sacrament is the Lord Jesus.[41]

---

[40] *Ibid*., p. 337.

As we have seen, Luther attempted to explain his understanding of the presence of Christ in the Supper with the help of the argument for the ubiquity of Christ's body. If Christ, or God in Christ, is present in all aspects of creation, then there is no reasonable objection to his presence in the Supper as the human Christ. Calvin was opposed to Luther's consubstantiatory teaching. We shall show why this is opposed to Calvin's fundamental presuppositions.

> Let us never (I say) allow these two limitations to be taken away from us : (1) Let nothing be withdrawn from Christ's heavenly glory--as happens when he is brought under the corruptible elements of this world, or bound to any earthly creatures. (2) Let nothing inappropriate to human nature be ascribed to his body, as happens when it is said either to be infinite or to be put in a number of places at once.[42]

The questions raised by the arguments in favor of and opposed to ubiquity are christological. Calvin argued that in a christological context we must comprehend a presence which does not restrict Christ to the elements on the one hand, nor circumscribe him in heaven on the other, so that he is not present in the elements. Otherwise we detract from his heavenly glory. Nor can we defend a belief in his corporal presence in many places simultaneously; for this is to detract from his human nature.[43]

---

[41] Brilioth, Faith and Practice, pp. 168-169.

[42] Battles, Institutes, II, pp. 1381-1382.

[43] Ibid.

To admit either the Roman or the Lutheran view was to deny a truly human nature to Christ, and thus invalidate any activity of identification with man. Calvin confutes both positions with a strong emphasis on the humanity of Christ:

> ...Christ's body was circumscribed by the measure of a human body. Again, by his ascension into heaven he made it plain that it is not in all places, but when it passes into one, it leaves the previous one.[44]

The proponents of ubiquity have forced their argument on others. They believe that

> unless the body of Christ can be everywhere at once, without limitation of place, it will not be credible that he lies hidden under the bread in the Supper. To meet this necessity, they have introduced the monstrous notion of ubiquity.[45]

Yet even the schoomen qualified this view. Calvin is "not ashamed" to point out that they argued thus: although the whole Christ is everywhere, the whole of that which is in him is not everywhere. If only the schoolmen had taken this seriously, he laments, the Church would have never been forced to defend the "absurd fiction" of the carnal presence.[46]

Christ is present everywhere--Calvin readily admitted this. But he is present in the Supper in a special way.

> Therefore, since the whole Christ is everywhere, our Mediator is ever present with his own people,

---

[44] *Ibid*, p. 1401.

[45] *Ibid*.

[46] *Ibid*., p. 1403.

> and in the Supper reveals himself in a special way, yet in such a way that the whole Christ is present, but not in his wholeness. For, as has been said, in his flesh he is contained in heaven until he appears in judgment.[47]

The stress on the sovereignty of Christ and the related emphasis on the promises is present again. The idea of the local presence is contrary, in Calvin's view, to this central concept. He thus rejects it as repugnant to christian doctrine. The idea of a descent to the elements leaves the door open to teachings that reduce Christ to an object of man, at the disposal of man.[48] For reasons both christological and sacramental, Calvin could not accept the concept of ubiquity as an explanation of the corporal presence of Christ in the Supper.

On the other hand, he was not willing to go so far as to localize the body of Christ in heaven, and bind him there. He agreed with Luther that the reign of Christ is extended over the whole world. Calvin interpreted the "sitting at the right hand of God" as Luther did when he said,

> Although he has taken his flesh away from us and in the body has ascended into heaven, he is nevertheless seated on the right hand of the Father, which is to say that he reigns in the power, majesty and glory of the Father.[49]

---

[47] *Ibid*.

[48] McDonnell, *Calvin*, p. 227. McDonnell notes that Calvin thought it docetic as well, *ibid*.

[49] Wendell, *Calvin*, p. 348.

Furthermore, in his Second Defence against Westphal, Calvin argues that Christ's presence at the right hand of God makes it impossible for him to be limited under the elements:

> For when we deny that Christ could be, as it were, hidden under the bread, this is not because, strictly speaking, he would be shut up somewhere, but because being raised above all elements, he dwells outside the world.[50]

A stronger statement of the local presence of Christ in heaven is not to be drawn from Calvin:

> Shall we therefore, someone will say, assign to Christ a definite region of heaven? But I reply with Augustine that this is a very prying and superfluous question; for us it is enough to believe that he is in heaven.[51]

Christ is indeed present in heaven, which is his proper place after his ascension. But his presence in the Supper is not thereby obviated; for through the power of the Holy Spirit the distance between heaven and earth is bridged. Thus it is possible for Calvin to deny ubiquity as well as strict circumscription in heaven for the body.[52]

---

[50] Ibid.

[51] Battles, Institutes, II, p. 1394.

[52] Joachim Beckmann, Vom Sakrament Bei Calvin: Die Sakramentslehre Calvins in ihren Beziehungen zu Augustin (Tübingen: Verlag von J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1926), p. 22. The question of the work of the Holy Spirit with regard to the presence of Christ in the Supper will be considered below. For further comments on the issue of ubiquity, cf. Ronald S. Wallace, Calvin's Doctrine of the Word and Sacrament (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1957), pp. 204-206; and cf. Heidler, Gegenwart, p. 30, Luther and Calvin on the assumption.

That Calvin is not hesitant in using terminology reminiscent of a realist concept of the presence of Christ will now be evident. However, this observation can be made with more vigor. In his Petit Traité, Calvin makes himself clear:

> Cela résolu, nous confesserons sans doute que de nier la vraie communication de Jésus Christ nous être présentée en la Cène, c'est rendre ce saint Sacrement frivole et inutile, que est un blasphème exécrable et indigne d'être écouté.[53]

There is, indeed, spiritual nourishment in the Supper. Nonetheless, Christ is what we receive:

> Pour nous sustenter donc en cette vie, il n'est pas question de repâitre nos ventres de viandes corruptibles et caduques, mais de nourrir nos âmes de pâture meilleure et plus précieuse. Or, toute l'Ecriture nous dit que le pain spirituel, dont nos âmes sont entretenues, est la même Parole par laquelle le Seigneur nous a régénérés; mais elle ajoute quand et quand la raison, d'autant qu'en icelle Jésus-Christ, notre vie unique, nous est donné et administré.[54]

Calvin had no difficulty with the fact of the real presence. He even agreed with his antagonist Westphal on the matter of the presence of the flesh in the Supper. But the controversy, he said, concerned the mode of reception. [55] Calvin did wish to reject the absurd suggestions of transubstantiation and related arguments:

---

[53] Schmidt, Oeuvres, II, p. 110.

[54] Ibid., p. 105.

[55] McDonnell, Calvin, pp. 223-224. Calvin rejected the Roman and Lutheran explanations of the real presence as dogma. He did not deny the fact, writes McDonnell.

> But when these absurdities have been set aside, I freely accept whatever can be made to express the true and substantial partaking of the body and blood of the Lord, which is shown to believers under the sacred symbols of the Supper--and so to express it that they may be understood not to receive it solely by imagination or understanding of mind, but to enjoy the thing itself as nourishment of eternal life.[56]

Elsewhere, Calvin asserts, "I confess that our souls are truly fed by the substance of Christ's flesh."[57] One cannot deny the substance of the flesh and blood of Christ in the communion without losing the value of the Supper.[58] Calvin openly confesses that we feed on the flesh and blood of Christ in the Supper in the same way as we receive nourishment for our bodies from the bread and wine.[59]

Calvin, then, believes that the natural body of Christ is that which we receive in the Supper. He opposes A' Lasco's arguments from this point of view. In a letter to Peter Martyr, Calvin objects that A' Lasco's conclusions always deny that we receive the natural body of Christ in the Supper, "as though we could gain life from any other source than the natural body of Christ."[60] He states explicitly that we receive more than the "effect" of Christ's body and blood; for we receive the body and blood themselves. It is not merely the benefit of the death and resurrection of Christ, but that body which died and rose again, which is presented in the Supper.[61]

---

[56] Battles, Institutes, II, p. 1382.

[57] McDonnell, Calvin, p. 233.

[58] Ibid.

[59] Ibid.

[60] Ibid., p. 242.

Wendel sees in Calvin a desire to give the Sacrament an objective content; and for this reason Calvin opposes those who would concede nothing more than a purely spiritual communion with Christ. The christian enters into communion with body and blood of Christ, as well as his spirit.[62]

Christ must be considered present in all his humanity in the Supper. There is such a full witness of the coming Christ and his work of redemption in the Supper that we must, argues Calvin, consider the elements presented to us as Christ himself, "touched with our own hands". When he said, "Take, eat, this is my body", he spoke the truth, and did not lie.

---

[61] Ibid, pp. 242-243. McDonnell makes the logical point that Calvin rejects Zwingli's conclusions as well, "because Zwingli has resolved the mystery and dissolved the dialectic of an objective presence by choosing one of the poles of the sacramental dialectic. This Calvin will not abide." p. 269. He also notes that "Zwingli and others had said that the Lord's Supper was a memorial of the redemptive fact, Calvary, but only a memorial. For Calvin this was not enough." p. 282. We are confronted again with an oversimplified statement of Zwingli's views. Nevertheless, Calvin and Zwingli certainly do not stress the real presence with equal force, as we have seen.

[62] Wendel, Calvin, p. 334. Wendel continues: "This idea, which is strongly emphasized on the Confession on the Eucharist of 1537, is also found in other writings of Calvin, and shows the persistence of his attachment to a conception of the Supper which would preserve all its reality." Ibid.

> By bidding us take, he indicates that it is ours; by bidding us eat, that it is made one substance with us; by declaring that his body is given for us and his blood shed for us, he teaches that both are not so much his as ours. For he took up and laid down both, not for his own advantage but for our salvation.[63]

The words must mean that Christ is truly present. Otherwise, the promises attached to the elements are absent, and the Sacrament is meaningless--an impossible situation in view of the fact of the promises. Thus the eating of Christ is quite clearly just that for Calvin. The eating is not simply a believing in Christ, according to Calvin. True, it is an eating of faith; but it is also a very real communication of Christ and all his benefits to us in the Supper.[64]

The figurative understanding of the presence of Christ is not sufficient for Calvin, in view of the above arguments. Commenting on Paul's words, "The bread which we break is a participation in the body of Christ; the cup which we consecrate to this by word and prayers is a participation in his blood", Calvin argues:

> There is no reason for anyone to object that this is a figurative expression by which the name of the thing signified is given to the sign. I indeed admit that the breaking of the bread is a symbol; it is not the thing itself. But, having

---

[63] Battles, *Institutes*, II, p. 1362.

[64] Cf. Beckmann, *Sakrament*, p. 16.

> admitted this, we shall nevertheless duly infer that by the showing of the symbol the thing itself is also shown. For unless a man means to call God a deceiver, he would never dare assert than an empty symbol is set forth by him. Therefore, if the Lord truly represents the participation in his body through the breaking of the bread, there ought not to be the least doubt that he truly presents and shows his body.[65]

That Calvin believed that faith played an important part in the reception of Christ in the Supper has already been established. However, this does not prevent him from asserting a very real presence. There is no place, he says for the "sophistry" that reception by faith means reception only by understanding and imagination. The promises of the Supper offer true participation in Christ, not merely knowledge of him.

> And indeed, I do not see how anyone can trust that he has redemption and righteousness in the cross of Christ, and life in his death, unless he relies chiefly upon a true participation in Christ himself. For those benefits would not come to us unless Christ first made himself ours.
>
> I say, therefore, that in the mystery of the Supper, Christ is truly shown to us through the symbols of bread and wine, his very body and blood, in which he has fulfilled all obedience to obtain righteousness for us. Why? First, that we may grow into one body with him; secondly, having been made partakers of his substance, that we may also feel his power in partaking of all his benefits.[66]

We might, then, sum up Calvin's attitude toward faith in the Supper by making three points: (1) that those who have no faith receive only the bare signs. Thus faith is a subjective controlling factor in reception; (2) what is received by faith is the body and blood of Christ. Of this there can be no substantial doubt as far as Calvin is concerned; (3) faith is also a fruit of the Supper, a result of the "stirring up" of Spirit and the participation in the body and blood of Christ.

---

[65] Battles, Institutes, II, pp. 1370-1371.

[66] Ibid., p. 1372.

What we receive in the Supper is the natural body of Christ, and the good things which he has done. Calvin had already asserted this in the *Petit Traité*:

> Il faut donc que nous recevions vraiment en la Cène le corps et le sang de Jésus Christ, puisque le Seigneur nous y représente la communion de l'un et de l'autre.... Nous avons donc à confesser que, si la représentation que Dieu nous fait en la Cène est véritable, la substance intérieure du Sacrement est conjointe avec les signes visibles: et comme le pain nous est distribué en la main, aussi le corps de Christ nous est communiqué, afin que nous en soyons faits participants.[67]

We note further that a similar emphasis is found in Calvin's commentary on I Corinthians 11:24. Calvin writes that in the Supper we possess Christ himself and his benefits. This possession of Christ means more than belief in his sacrifice for us on the Cross. It implies that we are members of his flesh, incorporated into him. The body of Christ, then, is given to us as nourishment for our souls: "I speak according to common parlance; but I mean that our souls are fed upon the substance of his body in order that we may in truth be made one with him."[68]

---

[67] Schmidt, *Oeuvres*, II, p. 112. It should be recalled that while Calvin asserted the reality of the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Supper, he asserted with equal vigor the reality of the signs. Cf. above, and McDonnell, *Calvin*, pp. 246, 240-241; Beckmann, *Sakrament*, p. 15.

Calvin continually asserts that the body must be present in the elements. It is required by the promissory nature of the Sacrament. There is no alternative--neither transubstantiation nor a mere figurative interpretation will do justice to this truth.

> Such is the presence of the body (I say) that the nature of the Sacrament requires a presence which we say manifests itself here with a power and effectiveness so great that it not only brings an undoubted assurance of eternal life to our minds, but also assures us of the immortality of our flesh. Indeed, it is. . .quickened by his immortal flesh, and in a sense partakes of his immortality.[69]

Given this attitude toward the Sacrament, Calvin, as we have seen had to oppose both the Lutherans and the Zwinglians. One group would not admit the reality of the signs chosen to be promises, the other would not admit the reality of the thing signified, thus undercutting the promissory nature of the Sacrament.[70]

---

[68] Wendel, *Calvin*, p. 340.

[69] Battles, *Institutes*, II, p. 1404; and cf. Heman, *Mysterium*, pp. 26-27.

[70] Beckmann, writes, "Wie Calvin die *Tatsächlichkeit* der Gegenwart Christi in Abendmahl gegen die Zwinglianer fest behauptet, so verteidigt er die besondere Eigenart dieser Präsenz gegen Rom und besonders die Lutheraner unter ausführlicher Zugrundgelegung einer christologischen Untersuchung über die *caro Christi*." *Sakrament*, p. 107; and note further his suggestion on the matter of Calvin's teaching of the presence of the body as an

While Calvin obviously believes firmly in the presence of the natural body, it ought to be understood that it is not a question of his belief in the reception of an invisible kind of substance or material in the Eucharist. The body does not act as a fluid which melts into that of the recipient.[71] Such a teaching would be impossible (at the least unlikely) in view of Calvin's strong rejection of transubstantiation.[72] There is, nevertheless, the question of Calvin's use of the word and/or concept "substance". We have seen that Calvin believes that the communicant receives the substance of the body of Christ. On the other hand, he rejects the dogmatism of Rome and Luther. We may distinguish three different applications of the term in Calvin: (1) the "substance or nature" of a thing, therefore

---

exhibitio corporis et sanguinis Christi. "Denn so lautet ja die Verheissung Gottes in den Einsetzungsworten. Diese bringen keineswegs die Substanz von Leib und Blut im Brot und Wein, sondern verheissen dem gläubigen Empfängender signa eine entsprechende ('simul') Exhibitio rei signatae. Insofer ist Christus wahrhaftig nach seiner Menschheit gegenwärtig im *Abendmahlsakt*, nicht in den Elementen." p. 105. This statement is intended to explain Calvin's opposition to the Lutheran and Roman concepts of the presence; however, it is equally clear that Calvin related the sign and the thing signified, and both were substantially present.

[71] Wendel, *Calvin*, p. 341.

[72] Note McDonnell's word of warning that there is danger"...in pushing Calvin's rejection of Zwingli to mean his acceptance of a substantialist position", as well as in thinking that his opposition to Rome and Luther meant a rejection of "sacramental realism". *Calvin*, p. 270.

the bodily substance, i.e. the "real and natural body of Christ". After 1536 Calvin consistently rejected the idea that this substance is what is given in the Supper. Rather its function was that of the source from which flowed the life which we gained from Christ; (2) Christ himself, considered as the "substance of the Sacrament". Christ is thus received by faith, in a personal union with him; (3) the substance of that which is given us when we receive Christ, or the benefits which proceed from his body. This is the "spiritual substance" of the body of Christ, whence it "flows into our souls".[73] With a confluence of such divergent uses, confusion is inevitable. There is rejection of the bodily substance; but there is also affirmation that the communicant participates in the body of Christ. There is no acceptable reason why we should deny that we are fed substantially by the flesh of Christ in the Supper; for we are truly united to Christ in faith. It follows, then, says Calvin, that "we are conjoined with him by a substantial fellowship", just as life force flows from the head to the members.[74]

Grass attempts an explanation of Calvin's use of what is frankly realist terminology by shifting the emphasis from the elements to the entire act of participation and stressing the substantial presence not of the flesh but of the power of Christ (thinking not unlike Beckmann at this point).

---

[73] Wendel, Calvin, pp. 341-342.

[74] Barclay, Protestant Doctrine, p. 225.

> Erweist sich einerseits die realistische Redeweise, dass wir im Abendmahl mit Fleisch und Blut sustantialiter [sic] gespeist werden, als cum grano salis zu verstehen, indem nicht die Substanz des Fleisches selbst, sondern Lebenskräfte aus derselben empfangen werden, so bleibt andererseits noch zu erwägen, was denn unter der Substanz des Fleisches selbst zu verstehen ist, die Quelle dieser Lebenskräfte sein soll.[75]

This appears to show a reluctance to admit the bald truth that Calvin does use realist terminology.

McDonnell's treatment is more satisfactory. Stressing (as he does throughout this very useful work) the importance of the concept of union with Christ, McDonnell can admit the language of Calvin on the matter of the presence without embarrassment. "In spite of all that he objects to in the term 'substantial', he uses it to designate that real joining between Christ and the recipient of the Eucharist."[76]

But perhaps Calvin himself deserves the last word on this question of his language. Speaking against the Romans, he notes:

> Yet I am not attempting to diminish anything of that communication of Christ's body, which I have confessed. My sole purpose is to refute the foolish stubborness with which they wrangle so violently over words. On Paul's and Luke's authority I understand the bread to be Christ's body, because it is the covenant in his body.[77]

---

[75] Grass, Abendmahlslehre, p. 253.

[76] McDonnell, Calvin, p. 254.

[77] Battles, Institutes, p. 1384.

It has been established that Calvin is fully committed to the presence of the natural body and blood of Christ in the Supper. We have, however, another question before us--namely, how does this occur? One reply, common to Luther and Calvin, is that this is a mystery:

> ...if anyone should ask me how this [the presence of Christ in the Supper] takes place, I shall not be ashamed to confess that it is a secret too lofty for either my mind to comprehend or my words to declare. And, to speak more plainly, I rather experience than understand it. Therefore, I here embrace without controversy the truth of God in which I may safely rest.[78]

Yet in expounding the presence of Christ, Calvin dwells upon this matter of the means of presence, thus giving us one of the distinctive elements of his thought, the relation of the activity of the Holy Spirit to the presence of Christ in the Supper. The Holy Spirit effects the presence of the body and blood of Christ at the time when the elements representing these are received by the communicant. Thus when Calvin says, "we maintain no other presence than that of a relationship", we must understand that relationship in terms of the activity of the Spirit.[79]

McDonnell suggests that Calvin presents his argument for the presence as effected by the Holy Spirit partly as an explanation of his concept of the presence which would not draw him into "that feigned inclusion of the body itself under the elements."[80] Furthermore, it is argued, the activity of the Holy Spirit in this context assures the knowledge of the promises of Christ, and the sealing of those promises by the real presence of Christ, effected by the Holy Spirit. Thus there is both subjectivity and objectivity in the Sacrament--subjectivity in the need for faith on the part of the recipient, objectivity which is the presence of Christ. Both, argues Calvin, are given by the Holy Spirit. We have in the Supper a "reale Gegenwart durch den Geist, der höchste Realität ist."[81]

---

[78] Ibid., pp. 1403-1404.

[79] McDonnell, Calvin, p. 231.

Calvin makes remarks which indicate this to be his understanding of the means of the real presence. Thus,

> ...our souls are fed by the flesh and blood of Christ in the same way that bread and wine keep and sustain physical life. For the analogy of the sign applies only if souls find their nourishment in Christ--which cannot happen unless Christ truly grows into one with us, and refreshes us by the eating of his flesh and the drinking of his blood.
>
> Even though it seems unbelievable that Christ's flesh, separated from us by such great distance, penetrates to us, so that it becomes our food, let us remember how far the secret power of the Holy Spirit towers above all our senses, and how foolish it is to wish to measure his immeasurableness, by our measure. What, then, our mind does not comprehend, let faith conceive: that the Spirit truly unites things separated in space.[82]

---

[80] *Ibid*., p. 257, and cf. p. 270.

[81] Beckmann, *Sakrament*, p. 14.

[82] Battles, *Institutes*, II, p. 1370.

The implication is clear that it is the Spirit which effects the participation in Christ's body in the Supper. By means of the Holy Spirit, Calvin thus enlightens his concept of the means.[83]

Further, he notes, "We say Christ descends to us both by the outward symbol and by his Spirit, that he may truly quicken our souls by the substance of his flesh and of his blood."[84] Opponents who have rejected the presence of the flesh of Christ in the Supper have not given suitable place to the action of the Spirit. Those who argue that there is no presence of flesh in the Supper unless it is confined to the bread are greatly mistaken. For thus they ignore the important work of the Spirit, who effects the unity of Christ and us. They would drag Christ down from heaven and enclose him in the bread, an unthinkable act. "...away with that calumny that Christ is removed from his Supper unless he lies hidden under the covering of bread!"[85]

Still very much concerned with those who do not give proper place to the Holy Spirit, he says:

> In the same way are we to judge concerning participation, which they do not recognize unless they swallow Christ's flesh under the bread. Yet a serious wrong is done to the Holy Spirit, unless we believe that it is through his incomprehensible power that we come to partake of Christ's flesh and blood.[86]

---

[83] Grass, Abendmahlslehre, p. 231.

[84] Battles, Institutes, II, p. 1390

[85] Ibid., p. 1403.

[86] Ibid., pp. 1405-1406.

Calvin feels that his opponents have missed his point on the matter of the action of the Holy Spirit. They say that he is teaching a merely spiritual reception. On the contrary, his point is that the reception of the body and blood of Christ is spiritual because it is the "secret power" of the Holy Spirit which is at work. The reception is, nonetheless, real. Calvin thus makes clear his use of the difficult term "spiritual"--it applies directly to the action of the Spirit in the Supper.[87]

It seems clear, then, that Calvin understood the activity of the Holy Spirit to be the power which made possible the participation in the flesh of Christ in the Supper. Wendel sums up the situation by stating that Calvin made two assertions side by side: (1) he argued that the body of Christ, the flesh of Christ, is really, truly present in the Supper; (2) he also asserted that the body has no local or spatial relationship with the material elements of the Eucharist. Christ is corporally present in heaven, and therefore cannot be enclosed in the elements of many altars.[88] These two statements, both of which have been noted and documented, seem _prima facie_ contradictory. Calvin successfully resolves this conflict by arguing for the power of the Holy Spirit to make possible participation in the body of Christ without enclosing the body in the elements.

---

[87] _Ibid_.

[88] Wendel, _Calvin_, pp. 350ff.

> Since we have no doubt but that [the body of Christ] has its limitations as the nature of a human body requires, and that it is contained in heaven, we also think it is illegitimate to bring it down among the corruptible elements, or to imagine it can be present everywhere. And in fact, that it is not really necessary for participation in it. Seeing that the Lord Jesus extends this benefit to us by his Spirit, that we are made one with him, body, spirit, and soul. However, the bond of this union is the Holy Spirit, by whom we are bound together, and who is like the canal or conduit through which all that Christ is or has comes down into us.[89]

Further, in Calvin's Last Warning, addressed to Westphal, he notes,

> I do not dispute that our flesh is restored by this spiritual food and drink, for we are communicating with Christ in hope of a blessed resurrection, and that is why it is necessary for us to unite ourselves to him not only in the soul but also in the flesh.[90]

He wrote to Bucer, towards the end of his life, that we "truly feed" on Christ here on earth, although his body was in heaven, through the "infathomable and omnipresent virtue of his Spirit." The power of the Spirit makes Christ so much our own, he argued, that a dislocation of Christ's body was not necessary. There was nothing absurd, he concluded, in our receiving the flesh and blood of Christ in the Supper substantially, so long as we believe that Christ "comes down toward us" through the working of the Spirit, as well as in the external symbols, and that we ascend to him by faith.[91]

---

[89] Ibid. With regard to this section, Wendel notes that the text remained unchanged in all editions of the Institutes. Also, "It was in a sermon which Erasmus had attributed to St. John Chrysostom and had included in the edition of his works published at Basle in 1539, that Calvin found the idea that the Holy Spirit is the bond of our union with Christ." Ibid.

[90] Ibid.

While it has been seen that Calvin argued for the activity of the Holy Spirit in the participation in the flesh of Christ, he also introduces a correlative action, that of the ascending of man to participate in Christ who is in heaven. This is significant; for if Christ is not joined to the elements themselves, he must remain in heaven. Yet the Holy Spirit makes true participation in the Supper, through the reception of the elements, possible. Thus what must occur is that the recipient is drawn up to heaven, after the fashion of the *sursum corda*. In a famous passage of the *Petit Traité*, he declares:

> Et ainsi protester qu'ils ne preténdaient nullement d'obscurir la vraie communion que nous donne le Seigneur en son corps et son sang par ce Sacrement.... Tant y a que, d'une part, il nous faut; pour exclure toutes fantaisies charnelles, élever les coeurs en haut au ciel, ne pensant pas que le Seigneur Jésus soit abaissé jusque-là, d'être enclos sous quelques éléments corruptibles. D'autre part, pour ne point amoindrer l'efficace de ce saint mystère, il nous faut penser que cela se fait par la vertu secrète et miraculeuse de Dieu, et que l'esprit de Dieu est le lien de cette participation, pour laquelle cause elle est appelée spirituelle.[92]

The *Institutes* reflects the same conception of union with Christ, indicating that Calvin held this to be a central theme in his presentation of the participation in Christ:

---

[91] *Ibid*. Cf. Wallace, *Word and Sacrament*, pp. 208ff., and Sasse, *Body*, p. 323.

[92] Schmidt, *Oeuvres*, II, pp. 140, 141.

> But if we are lifted up to heaven with our eyes and minds, to seek Christ there in the glory of his Kingdom, as the symbols invite us to him in his wholeness, so under the symbol of bread we shall be fed by his body, under the symbol of wine we shall separately drink his blood to enjoy him at last in his wholeness.

For though Christ's flesh has been taken away in the ascension and sits on the right hand of the father, the kingdom of the father is not bounded by any locational limitations. Christ is not prevented from exercising whatever power he pleases wherever he pleases, though he is present in heaven.[93] The analogy of the _sursum corda_ is evident here. The result of such an elevation of our eyes and minds is that Christ is always among his own people, breathes life into them, sustains and strengthens them as though he continued to be present in his body. He may be said to feed his people with his own body, the communion of which he grants by the power of the Holy Spirit. The body and blood of Christ are before us in the Sacrament in this manner.[94]

The recipient, therefore, ought not to focus his attention on the signs themselves. Rather, his heart and soul must be raised to heaven to Christ. We are not bound to the elements for Christ, but are urged to lift up our hearts in communion with him in heaven.[95]

---

[93] Battles, _Institutes_, II, p. 1381.

[94] _Ibid_.

The related concepts of the activity of the Holy Spirit and the analogy of the sursum corda as the paradigm for union with Christ make it possible for Calvin to assert the real presence of the body of Christ on the one hand, and to reject the limitation of the body of Christ to the elements on the other. Nevertheless, his continual use of such realist terms as "truly", "corporally", "essentially", and "substantially" came to be sources of difficulty when he attempted to explain himself to his contemporaries. He seemed to be Lutheran in language, and a believer in a spiritual presence in content.[96]

Wendel notes a difficulty with Calvin's doctrine, namely the problem of how he could maintain that the faithful "really" receive the flesh of Christ in the Supper. It may be that he holds to this belief because of his strong piety rather than his desire for systematic expression of the faith. The presence of Christ would, in this case, be affirmed with vigor, as is indeed the case, despite implications which might contradict his rejection of the corporal inclusion.[97] McDonnell, as we have seen, appears to suggest something very like this resolution. Calvin rejected the Roman and Lutheran concepts of the presence because they were not "real" enough. The "Zwinglian" conception was not "real" enough either. Calvin demanded the presence of the "real"Christ, and the real presence of Christ. His focus is on the real presence of Christ, not on the means, on the union with Christ, not the problem of how it is carried out--though obviously the difficulties involved were not lost on him. If this be piety, then Calvin's piety is responsible for his stress on the real presence.

---

[95] Grass, Abendmahlslehre, p. 228.

[96] The language which was found most comprehensible both to him and to Bullinger--and therefore many others--can be seen in the Consensus Tigurinus of 1549, which we shall discuss below.

[97] Wendel, Calvin, p. 354.

It has been the custom of past years to assign to Calvin's teaching of the presence of Christ in the Supper the tag "virtualism", "symbolic virtualism", or "dynamic virtualism".[98] McDonnell makes a very strong case for opposing the unqualified use of this tag. Briefly, the objection may be stated thus:

> Before one makes a hasty judgment in favor of a "virtualist" interpretation of Calvin, his doctrine of the efficacy of the sacramental signs should be recalled. When God says that we should eat his flesh and drink his blood, then he means this and nothing less. When he says that we are to take and eat, for this is his body, we cannot believe that we receive anything but what his mouth tells us and the signs proclaim to us.[99]

The difficulty, from the viewpoint of Calvin's teaching, is that the "virtualist" tag does not allow sufficient weight for Calvin's clear use of realist terminology, nor his refusal to hedge on the matter of the presence of the flesh and blood of Christ in the Supper. It is "virtualism" which is hesitant to assert this, not Calvin.

---

[98] Cf., e.g. Barclay, Protestant Doctrine, pp.126-127, 132-133.

[99] McDonnell, Calvin, p. 243.

Further, according to McDonnell, the platonic preconceptions of Calvin must be kept in mind:

> By means of the concepts of image and participation, Calvin can insist that the heavenly reality remains in heaven and the body of Christ is really given. The _opposita_ of the dialectic must be maintained in union and tension. A pure virtualist interpretation does not do justice to either the content or framework of Calvin's eucharistic doctrine; indeed it reduces the Supper to little more than a phantom of Christ's body.[100]

That a dialectic exists between heaven and earth, between the body of Christ in heaven and the body of Christ in the Sacrament, seems apparent. It also seems to be true that Calvin wishes the dialectic to remain unaltered--he will neither bring Christ down to the elements, nor will he disconnect the elements from the body of Christ. It must follow, then, that "virtualism" does not do justice to this dialectic, and McDonnell's point appears to stand. "Virtualism" can only be used with severe qualification, if at all.[101] Thus in the future we ought to avoid such misleading statements as that of Fr. Clark:

According to Calvin's theory of "virtualism",

---

[100] _Ibid_., pp. 244-245.

[101] McDonnell, however, would do better to restrict his generous use of the term "platonic" as a description of Calvin's position. It may well be neo-platonic, or very like neo-platonism.

> while the godly communicant receives the material bread and wine, which are figures symbolizing Christ's body and blood, a power simultaneously emanates from the body of Christ in heaven and is communicated to the recipient by the Holy Spirit.[102]

This is not only a simplification of Calvin's subtlety, it is evidence of a misunderstanding of the role of the signs in the Supper. Virtualism, then, is only a label, not a concept taken from Calvin.

It should be noted that though Calvin suggested the activity of the Holy Spirit as the means of the presence of the flesh of Christ in the Supper, the mystery of the matter was not ignored. How the presence occurs is experienced rather than understood by Calvin.[103]

Summing up briefly, Calvin rejected transubstantiation because it destroyed the parallelism of sign and thing signified: "Die similitudo, die analogia, gerade als äusseres *Symbol* der geheimnisvollen göttlichen Wirklichkeit (veritas spiritualis) darf nicht verloren gehen."[104] Further, the inclusion of the body under the bread and wine, as Luther suggested, was unacceptable for the reason that Christ "nec *in panem includat* nec ullo modo circumscribat--quae omnia derogare *coelesti* eius *gloriae* palam est."[105] It was unacceptable because it did not allow the true humanity of Christ:

---

[102] Clark, *Sacrifice*, p. 119.

[103] McDonnell, *Calvin*, p. 206.

[104] Beckmann, *Sakrament*, pp. 107-108. [105] *Ibid*.

> deinde quae nec mensuram illi suam auferat, vel pluribus simul locis distrahat, vel immensam illi magnitudinem affingat, quae per coelum et terram diffundatur--haec enim naturae humani veritati non obscure repugnant.[106]

The role of faith, furthermore, is important to Calvin. Without faith, the recipient obtains only bread and wine. It acts as a subjective controlling factor in the reception of the true body and blood of Christ.

On the other hand, the belief in the presence ought not to be a belief in merely intellectual participation. The reality of the presence is demanded in the Sacrament by its nature.[107] The result of Calvin's rejection of these positions is his doctrine of the real presence of Christ--the participation in him effected by the Holy Spirit, which participation is described in terms of the sursum corda.[108]

Calvin's position occupies the middle ground between Luther and Zwingli. McDonnell makes the point that this was not deliberately so from Calvin's part; for Calvin's teaching "incidentally stands between the two traditions. That he acted as a mediator between the two groups did not arise out of his desire to stand in the middle. Rather because he was in the middle, he desired to mediate."[109] Sasse, on the other hand, states that Calvin tries to find the via media between Luther and Zwingli in his doctrine of the Lord's Supper.[110]

---

[106] Ibid., ital. Beckmann.   [107] Ibid.

[108] Beckmann suggests that the following be kept in mind when one examines any presentation of Calvin's thought: "Die innere dogmatische Einheit der Gedanken ist so stark, dass man kein Stück aus dem Zusammenhand lösen kann, da sich alle Einzelheiten gegenseitig bedingen." Ibid. In this case, christology, soteriology, and sacramental theology are hardly separable.

The question of Calvin's position vis-à-vis other Reformers is closely related to the above statement. For example, Rilliet attempts to distinguish Calvin from Zwingli as follows: "Calvinism is differentiated from Zwinglianism by the assertion of this real mystical communion between the Risen Lord and his disciples."[111] He goes on to make what might be considered superfluous comments in view of the importance of the Eucharistic controversy: "In the last analysis is it a matter of mere verbal difference? Behind the words which clash, do not believers--as is so often the case in theology--envisage one and the same spiritual reality?"

Barclay took up this torch in a very thoroughgoing fashion indeed, shedding light on all parties and finding the rooms in each castle identically furnished. Thus Zwingli, Calvin, and Luther are basically at one on the following: (1) their concepts of the nature of the heavenly gift given to the communicants; (2) the more or less equal efficacy of the word alone and the word of the Sacrament; (3) the importance of sacramental objectivism in both Luther and Calvin (though on the matter of means they disagree thoroughly); (4) their concepts of communion of the unworthy, the _manducatio impiorum_. Further, they are held to have shared generally the same view of substance.[112] Moreover, Calvin's teaching is seen to be an outgrowth of Zwingli's teaching. In other words, there is a Protestant Doctrine of the Eucharist. The three Reformers are really not so very far separate, and on "basic"issues are actually related. It can only be said that it is a shame that Barclay's spiritual ancestor Bucer was unable to convince the protagonists that this was the case.[113]

---

[109] McDonnell, Calvin, pp. 224-225.

[110] Sasse, Body, p. 322. The question is moot, it appears to me. There are no means of proving the matter one way or the other.

[111] Rilliet, Zwingli, pp. 117-118.

Wendel argues that Calvin and Bucer had very much in common. Bucer, indeed, is said to have made a substantial contribution to Calvin's thinking on the question of the presence of Christ in the Supper. Wendel cites Bucer's evangelical commentary, and Calvin's writings in 1536. On the question of receiving the elements and the concomitant nourishment of the soul by the body of Christ, Wendel indicates that Bucer was very much in favor of Calvin's views on these matters as presented in the latter's _Confession of Faith_ of 1537, and at the Synod of Berne, March, 1549.[114]

---

[112] Barclay, _Protestant Doctrine_, pp. 232ff.

[113] Note also the reference, above, to the centrality of Ratramnus' doctrine to the whole of the Reformed community. Thus Barclay is even able to bring the Romans and the Protestants together. Again, a pity that the fathers of Trent remained unconvinced. Cf. _ibid_., pp. 285ff., and McDonnell, _Calvin_, pp. 52-53.

Barclay, for the reasons indicated, has gone too far. The statements of Rilliet indicate some confusion on the matter of what it was that Calvin did teach. That Calvin was different from Zwingli is a readily demonstrable fact, which no amount of zeal for unity will erase. The question of the relation between Calvin and Bucer will be better resolved after our discussion of Bucer and Martyr. At this point, it seems most advantageous to enter into a discussion of the most obvious example of Calvin's relationship with another Reformer--this a favorable one-- the _Consensus Tigurinus_. In order to comment, however, on that matter--an important one for our interest in the Eucharistic doctrine of Cranmer--and the presence of "Zwinglianism" in England and on the Continent--we must devote some space to the co-signer, Heinrich Bullinger.

When one considers the problem of the presence of "Zwinglianism" either in England or on the Continent, it ought to be kept in mind that Zwingli died in the battle of Kapel in 1531. He was succeeded by Bullinger as chief pastor of the Grossmünster in Zürich. Bullinger retained this post until his death in 1575.

---

[114] McLelland, _Words_, p. 332. Similar opinions may be found in A. Edward Harvey, "Martin Bucer in England" (Inaugural-Dissertation zur Erlangung der Doctorwürde der Hohen Philosophischen Fakultät der Universität Marburg; Marburg: Buchdruckerei Heinrich Bauer, 1906), p. 101, where most of Calvin's major doctrines are attributed to Bucer; and Van De Poll, _Ideas_, p. 90, where Melanchthon is added to the group.

Bullinger believes that the Sacraments are composed of two elements, the thing signified and the sign. They are

> mystical symbols, or holy rites, or sacred actions ordained by God Himself, consisting of His word, of outward signs, and of things signified: whereby he keeps in continual memory, and recalls to mind, in his Church, his great benefits bestowed upon man; and whereby he seals up his promises, and outwardly represents, and, as it were, offers unto our sight those things which inwardly he performs unto us, and therewithal strengthens and increases our faith through the working of God's Spirit in our hearts.[115]

The Sacraments thus have God's promises annexed to them.

The chief thing in the Sacraments is Christ, the only sacrifice, Rock of the Fathers, slain from the foundation of the world.[116] The covenantal context for the Sacraments is apparent. Christ is the center of the promise of the covenant, and is thus the chief element in the Sacraments. To Christ, the thing signified, is joined the signs, of the elements: "For Christ, the only mediator and saviour of the faithful, is the chief thing and substance in them both /i.e. Baptism and the Lord's Supper/."[117] For

---

[115] John H. Leith, Creeds of the Churches (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1963), p. 162.

[116] *Ibid*., p. 163.

[117] *Ibid*., and cf. Heinrich Bullinger, A Most Excellent Sermon of the Lordes Supper, trans I. T. /John Tomkys/ (London: Printed for William Ponsonby, 1577), n.p.

Bullinger, therefore, both sign and thing signified are present.

Bullinger would not, however, accept the explanation of the relationship between the two things as offered by transubstantiation. It was man's thought, not God's truth. He argued that the true church was the primitive church. In his opinion the late medieval scholastic church had dealt harshly with the word of God. This is seen in the opening section of Bullinger's own history of the Reformation (up to the death of Zwingli), the Reformationsgeschichte. He begins the work with the following description of the plight of the church: "nun von ettlich hundert iaren har", i.e. a few centuries before 1519, priests were corrupting the church. They had left the New Testament behind. They had polluted their studies and teachings with "Scholasticum Theologiam" and the "ius pontificium".[118] Transubstantiation was part of this corruption:

> For this doctrine of Transubstantiation is clean contrary both to the doctrine of the apostles and evangelists touching the true incarnation of our Lord, and the true raising up again of our bodies.... That the article of Transubstantiation is neither expressed in the Creed of the Apostles, neither in those creeds of the ancient fathers; but that it was brought in and invented of the Church, under Innocentius the third, in the Council of Lateran. Whereby we gather that the doctrine of Transubstantiation is of late time newly start

---

[118] Heinrich Bullinger, Reformationsgeschichte, ed. J. J. Hottinger and H. H. Vögeli (Frauenfeld: Druck und Verlag von Ch. Beeil, 1838), p. 3.

up.[119]

The Supper cannot be considered as an opus operatum, according to Bullinger, for the reason that faith is so important to the true reception of the Supper. There must be faith on the part of the recipient. As we receive meat into ourselves in order that it may be useful and efficacious, so we must receive Christ by faith so that he may be efficacious to us.[120] Faith in the promise of God is a criterion for true participation. Only believers receive the fruit of the Sacrament. Thus Bullinger argues that as we do not measure the value of Sacraments according to the worthiness of the ministers, so we do not assess them by the condition of the receivers. The value and merit of the Sacraments depends upon the "faithfulness" and goodness of God.

> The sacraments, consisting of the Word, the signs, and the things signified, continue true and perfect sacraments, not only because they signify holy things, but also because God offers the things signified, howsoever the unbelievers receive not the things which are offered.[121]

Thus what is offered by God in the Sacrament, the body and blood of Christ, is not received by unbelievers, though it is in truth offered. Faith is the determining factor in true reception. Transubstantiation, therefore, must be rejected. The signs and the things signified are not "mingled", but remain separate and distinct. Yet although this is true, both appear in the Sacrament. A "perfect and lawful" Sacrament, then, consists in both.[122] Both the thing signified and the sign must be present. Thus

---

[119] The Decades of Henry Bullinger, trans. H. I., ed. for the Parker Society by Thomas Harding (4 Vol.; Cambridge, England: The University Press, 1849-1852), IV, pp. 277,278.

[120] Leith, Creeds, p. 173.

[121] Ibid., pp. 166-167.

> it is no sacrament, if we eat bread in a common assembly and drink wine of the self-same cup after the common manner; neither is it a sacrament, if through a faithful remembrance thou consider that the Lord's body was betrayed for thee...; but so far forth as they are all mysteries of God and our salvation, they are generally termed sacraments, that is, secret and spiritual mysteries of God and our salvation.[123]

If, as Bullinger appears to indicate, mere common eating and drinking together is not a Sacrament, nor even the remembering of the work of Christ, then there must exist a special relationship between the elements of the Supper and the body of Christ. The signs and the thing signified exist in a special manner in the Supper. Indeed, Bullinger states that Christ's body and blood are present to the faithful in the Supper, in a letter to Blarer of 22 October, 1534. Köhler refers to this document as a "kurzen Bekenntnis". The document focuses on one essential point: the body and blood of Christ are truly present in the Supper and eaten and drunk by the faithful. From this follow five conclusions: (1) Christ is present; (2) the sensible body of Christ is not enclosed in the elements; (3) while Christ is present at the right hand of the father in his corporal body, he is present in the Supper "Sacramentally" to the faithful; (4) transubstantiation and the concept of the corporal presence are denied; (5) the Sacrament is a mystery, and the elements are not mere signs. Bullinger concludes, "Das ist unser Bekenntnis, die wir in Zürich Christus predigen."[124]

---

[122] Decades, IV, pp. 277-278. [123] Ibid., p. 278.

In this brief letter we have on the one hand the presence of Christ's body and blood in the Supper, to be eaten and drunk by the faithful, and on the other the denial of transubstantiation and the rejection of "Jede servitus carnalis". Christ is at the right hand of the father, "in loco aliquo coeli propter veri corporis modum." Elsewhere, Bullinger rejects a carnal presence, one in which Christ is limited to the elements:

> There is nothing which the Lord repeateth more diligently, nor more often unto his disciples..., than ...that he would no longer be neither [sic] with them, nor with the church, bodily.... Those things which are spoken of the presence of the Lord, in the church, and of eating him, must not be expounded carnally, nor corporally, but spiritually; and that the heavenly word eaten spiritually, profiteth.[125]

Commenting on the words "This is my body", Bullinger insists that the words ought not to be taken in any literal sense, but ought to be expounded mystically or sacramentally; "for the head remaineth in his substance, and is not changed into the substance of the body of Christ." With our mouths we receive the "sacramental head" of Christ's body. But with the mouth of the Spirit we receive the very body and blood of Christ. He is eaten by faith, which is the fashion in which he may be eaten. This is the purest tradition.[126]

---

[124] Köhler, *Zwingli und Luther*, p. 346.

[125] Bullinger, *Sermon*, n.p.

As the memorial aspect of the Supper was important to Zwingli, it is important to Bullinger:

> For the Lord by the Holy Assembly of his people, by this action [the Sacrament], would that we should retain, and imprint in our memory, this great benefit and mystery of our redemption and of his passion, that is to say, that he has delivered his body to death for us and our salvation.[127]

This is not to deny, however, the place of the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Supper, to be eaten by the faithful. The question before us is not so very different from that presented by Calvin's denial of the inclusion of the body of Christ in the bread and the affirmation of the real presence. How is the presence effected? With Calvin, it is the activity of the Holy Spirit granting us true participation in the body of Christ on the one hand, and our rising up to be joined to Christ in heaven, after the fashion of the _sursum corda_, on the other. Bullinger believes in the reality of both the sign and the thing signified, as we have seen.[128] Faith is an essential part of the reception of the body and blood of Christ.

---

[126] _Ibid_.

[127] _Ibid_.

[128] Note _Decades_, IV, p. 456: "God most perfectly and fully performeth that which he hath promised."

Scripture

> teacheth, that our life or salvation, and our justification, consisteth in faith only, which we repose in the body which was given and the blood shed for us (which is the spiritual eating), not in any work of ours, much less in the bodily eating of Christ's body.[129]

Thus to eat the flesh and drink the blood of Christ is to believe that his body was given for us, and his blood shed for our sins. Consequently we live in Christ and he in us. This is not, however, a matter of merely imagining the events of the past, but rather, "a most certain assurance and a feeling" of heavenly things received, to our comfort. Faith is not merely a state of mind for Bullinger, but rather a "virtue and force" which we experience. It was of this, he says, that the Lord spoke in the sixth chapter of John.[130]

Concomitant with faith as well as identical with it, is the eating and drinking of the body and blood of Christ in the Sacrament. This is what the faithful do in the Supper. Commenting on Judas' presence at the Last Supper, Bullinger remarks that he received the elements of the Supper, as did the other disciples; but because he received them without faith, he did not partake of Christ, i.e. he did not eat and drink the Lord's body and blood. Those who eat and drink the body and blood of Christ neither hunger nor thirst. Neither do they die. For "they dwell in Christ, and Christ in them."[131] Thus while it sometimes appears in Bullinger's writings that faith and the eating of the body and blood of Christ are identical, it is also true that they are not so much identical as interdependent. It can be seen, nevertheless, that there is a union with Christ in the Supper by faith. Thus Judas, being without faith, did not receive the body and blood of Christ. "Those who eat the Lord's body and drink his blood...dwell in Christ." There is a real union with Christ, a participation in him which is linked to the Supper.

---

[129] _Ibid_., p. 442.

[130] _Ibid_., p. 458. Bullinger here agrees with Calvin in rejecting the idea that faith is merely intellectual appreciation.

How is this participation possible? The Supper was instituted by the Lord,

> that he might visibly gather together into one body all his members, which were in a manner dispersed throughout all parts of the world. Whereupon we have said that the holy men somewhere else did call the supper a league or confederacy. We are knit invisibly with Christ and all his members by unity of faith and participation of one Spirit.[132]

Thus, while Bullinger wishes to refer to the unity of the Church in the Supper, he wishes also to make clear the matter of the unity of believers with Christ--a unity which is accomplished by the participation in the Supper. Note that the power of the Holy Spirit is introduced in this discussion of unity with Christ. It may be suggested that participation in Christ, then, is an activity distinctly related to the Holy Spirit, and in turn related to the body and blood of Christ, and thus to the elements of the Supper. Christ is clearly present in the Supper. An important quotation may be adduced to make this point clear:

---

[131] _Ibid_., p. 465.

[132] _Ibid_., p. 467.

> ...I do expressly profess, that I condemn not or flatly am against all manner of Christ's presence in the church, and in the action also of the Supper; for I am flat against that bodily presence of Christ in the bread, which the papists defend and enforce upon the church of God. But I confess and acknowledge with open mouth and sincere heart that spiritual, divine, and quickening presence of our Lord Christ, both in the Supper and also out of the Supper, whereby he continueth to pour himself into us, not by signs lacking life, but by his Holy Spirit, to make us partakers of all his good graces, to justify, quicken, nourish, sustain, and satisfy us: which presence we do also feel in ourselves through faith, by the which we are both sustained, nourished, and satisfied. For Christ is the head of his church, and we have fellowship with him. But how should a living body be without his head? How should we be partakers of Christ, if we should not feel him present, yea, living and working in us?[133]

Christ is given to us by the action of the Holy Spirit, in the Supper, and also out of it. Bullinger's arguments indicate that there is present the thing signified, as well as the sign. We participate in the body and blood of Christ by the action of the Holy Spirit.

This is not to assert that Calvin and Bullinger are carbon copies of each other, though Bullinger speaks very highly of Calvin, "a godly and learned man, who with great commendation teaches in the church at this day, my fellow-minister and most well-beloved and dear brother."[134] The Consensus Tigurinus, however, must not be ignored. It is suggested here, on the basis of the foregoing, that Calvin and Bullinger had a great deal in common in their respective concepts of the presence of Christ in the Supper. Thus the Consensus Tigurinus is neither a surprising phenomenon nor evidence of great concession on either side.

---

[133] _Ibid_., p. 452.

The bare fact of Bullinger's presence and work in Zürich for forty-four years after 1531 should justify suspicions regarding the equation of what went under the rubric "Zwinglian" or "Zurichian" during the middle decades both on the Continent and in England with the teaching of Zwingli, regardless of any opinions concerning the latter. When estimating the impact of the Continental on the English Reformation, this ought to be remembered. To call Hooper, for example, a simple "Zwinglian," without qualification, seems to be a serious simplification of the issue. Hooper was a good friend and follower of Bullinger, not of Zwingli.

Related to the problem of what is "Zwinglian" in this period is the fact that Calvin and Bullinger came to an agreement on the matter of the presence of Christ in the Supper. This would imply that Calvin and Bullinger had enough in common either at the beginning of the confrontations which resulted in the Consensus or at the end to permit such a statement as the *Consensus* to be issued. It is the contention here that this is true. Can we then continue to speak of the "Calvinist" doctrine of the Lord's Supper on the one hand, and the "Zurichian" or even "Zwinglian" doctrine on the other? Surely we cannot, at least without serious qualification.

---

[134] Ibid., p. 476.

Letters were exchanged between Calvin and Bullinger prior to the meeting of May 1549 which resulted in the *Consensus*. Some light is shed on the respective attitudes of the Reformers on the questions involved. In February 1547, Calvin sent a letter expounding his position on the matter to Bullinger.[135] The emphasis on the presence of Christ in heaven, yet belief in the participation in his body and blood are evident, as is the emphasis on the faith of the recipient in the participation.

Calvin wrote to Bullinger again in June 1548, stating with terse precision his doctrine of the

---

[135] "Dico *memoriam rei praesentis* in coena esse. Atque *memoria* est rerum absentium. Neque id pugnat. Abest enim Christus a coena quoad oculos, quoad omnes corporis sensus, quoad *locum*. Nam in coelo est eius corpus. Coena peragitur in terris. Longa distantia. Sed adest piis animis per spiritus sui virtutem, quia non impedit Christi distantia, quominus nos mirabiliter pascat. Eiusdem est rationis locus illi Pauli: celebrate mortem Domini donec veniat. Neque enim descendit ad nos Christus e coelo nequi oculis cernitus, sed *fide* tantem nobis adest. Nec quidquam obstat, quominus *essentialiter*, hos est, ipsemet revera Christus exhibeatur nobis et tamen venturus expectetur usque ad diem resurrectioniis, quia in coela manet...." Beckmann, *Sakrament*, pp. 105-106, note 1. Ital. Beckmann.

Supper.[136] With the signs are eaten the things signified, for not in vain are the things signified promised to us. It follows, then, that we eat and drink the body and blood of Christ. There is no question, nevertheless, of Calvin's opposition to the corporal inclusion of Christ in the elements, or to transubstantiation. Briefly, he argues, we are made participants of Christ and his benefits in the Supper.

We turn to the Consensus itself. The *Consensus mutua in re Sacramentâria ministrorum Tigurinae ecclesiae et D. Ioannis Calvini ministri Genevensis ecclesiae*[137] clearly denies the teachings of transubstantiation,[138] and the adoration of the Sacrament as though Christ were present there.[139] Christ's body is in heaven, as far from us as heaven is from earth.[140] The positive statements are, however, those which command our attention. Article III asserts that Christ is communicated to us.[141]

---

[136] *Ibid*., pp. 106-107.

[137] Peter Brooks, *Thomas Cranmer's Doctrine of the Eucharist* (London: Macmillan, 1965), p. 60, comments:"... one of the most impressive of all Reformation documents on the question of the Eucharist."

[138] *Documents Illustrative of the Continental Reformation*, ed. B. J. Kidd (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911), pp. 652-656, art. XXIV.

[139] *Ibid*., art. XXVI. [140] *Ibid*., art. XXV.

[141] "Sic ergo habendum est, Christum quum aeternus esset Dei Filius, eiusdem cum Patre essentiae et floriae, induisse carnem nostram, et iure adoptionis id quod natura proprium habebat, nobis communicaret, nempe ut simus filii Dei: quod fit, dum fide inserti in corpore Christi, idque Spiritus sancti virtute, primum iusti censemur gratuita iustitiae imputatione."

The key note of justification and the identification with Christ, through the power of the Holy Spirit, is struck. Article IV continues the description of the activity of Christ on behalf of man, and the activity of the Holy Spirit:

> Considerandus est tanquam victima expiatrix, qua placatus est Deus mundo.... Considerandus est reparator, qui Spiritus sui virtute reformat quicquid in nobis est vitiosum, ut mundo vivere desinamus et carni, ac Deus ipse in nobis vivat....

Article V tells of how Christ is shown to us:

> Porro, ut se nobis talem exhibeat Christus....

There is communication, therefore, with Christ in the christian life. In order to make such a union possible, the preaching of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments were instituted:

> Haec spiritualis est communicatio, quam habemus cum Filio Dei, dum Spiritu suo in nobis habitans facit credentes omnes, omnius quae in se resident bonorum compostes. Cuius testificandae causatam Evangelii praedicatio instituta quam Sacramentorum usus nobis commendatus, nempe sacri Baptismi et sacrae Coenae.

Article VIII expounds the position further, noting the importance of the work of the Holy Spirit in the Supper:

> Quum autem vera sint, quae nobis Dominus dedit gratiae suae testimonia et sigilla, vere proculdubio praestat ipse intus suo Spiritu, quod oculis et aliis sensibus figurant Sacramenta: hoc est, ut potiamur Christo, tanquam bonorum omnius fonte: tum ut beneficio mortis eius reconciliemur Deo, Spiritu renovemur in vitae sanctitatem, iustitiam denique ac salutem consequamur, simulque pro his beneficiis olim in cruce exhibitus, fide vero perceptis a nobis et quae quotidie fide percipimus iam agamus gratias.

The reality of both the sign and the thing signified in the context of faith, promises of God, is asserted in Articles IX and X:

> ...non disiungimus a signus veritatem: quin omnes qui fide amplectuuntur illic oblatas promissiones, Christum spiritualiter cum spiritualibus eius dones recipere, adeoquo et qui dudum participes facti erant Christi, communionem illam continuare ac reparare fateamur.
>
> Ne que enim ad signa nuda, sed potius ad promissionem, quae illic annexa est, respicere convenit. Quatenus ergo in promissione illic oblata proficiat nostra fides, eatenus ista vis et efficacia, quam dicimus, se exserit. Ita materia aquae, panis aut vini, Christum nequaquam nobis offert, nec spiritualium eius donorum compotes nos facit: sed promissio magis spectanda est, cuius partes sunt nos recta fidei via ad Christum ducere, quae fides nos Christi participes facit.

The need for both sign and thing signified is asserted in a typical Calvinistic context, that of the promises of God and participation in Christ. Bullinger agrees.

Article XII notes again the work of the Spirit. God, and thus the Holy Spirit, work in the Supper:

> Deus enim solus est, qui Spiritu suo agit, et quod sacramentorum ministerio utitur, ineo neque vim illis suam infundit, nec Spiritus sui efficaciae quicquam derogat: sed pro ruditatis nostrae captu ea tanquam adminicula sic adhibet, ut tota agendi facultas maneat apud ipsum solum.

It is, furthermore, the Spirit which grants the fruit of the Sacrament: "Nam quemadmodum non alios in fidem illuminant, quam quos praeordinavit ad vitam: ita arcana Spiritus sui virtute efficit ut percipiant electi quae offerunt sacramenta."[142]

Again, as at the baptism of Cornelius the Holy Spirit gave the washing of regeneration, "lavacrum regenerationis", "Sic in Coena se nobis communicat Christus, qui tamen et prius se nobis impertierat et perpetuo manet in nobis."[143]

Finally, we feed on Christ in the Supper through the power of the Holy Spirit. Article XXIII makes this point:

> Quod autem carnis suae esu et sanguinis potione, quae hic figurantur, Christus animas nostras per fidem Spiritus sancti virtute pascit, id non perinde accipiendum quasi fiat aliqua substantiae vel commixtio vel transfusio; sed quoniam ex carne semel in sacrificium oblata et sanguine in expiationem effuso vitam hauriamus.

The major part of the text of the *Consensus* has been reported in order to show as clearly as possible the matters on which Calvin and Bullinger agreed. The outstanding ones appear to be the following: (1) the link between the action of the Holy Spirit and the participation in Christ; (2) the primary role of faith on the one hand and the promises of God on the other, in the reception of the Sacrament and the fruits thereof; (3) the denial of transubstantiation and the inclusion of Christ under the elements; and (4) the relationship between the elements of the Supper and the body and blood of Christ, and thus a denial of the statement that the elements are *signa nuda*.

---

[142] Art. XVI. Cf. Beckmann's comment on *electio et fides*, *Sakrament*, p. 17.

[143] Art. XIX.

These points are, it appears, the most significant problems of the Eucharistic debate on the matter of the real presence. Calvin and Bullinger thus hold a very similar doctrine of the Presence of Christ.

To speak of Zwinglianism after 1549 is to invite confusion, with regard to both the English Reformation, and the Continental Reformation.

The matter could not be regarded as ended until we have dealt with the question of whether or not Calvin made important concessions to Bullinger during the composition of this document. The weighty opinion of Wendel is thrown to the opinion that the document is not a statement of Calvin's real teaching.[144] Wendel says that Calvin emphasised his own understanding of the Supper more after he realized that it was acceptable neither to the Lutherans or the Zwinglians. He did come to an agreement with Bullinger on the question of the Eucharist. but only at the price of repeated "concessions" on both sides. Thus it is "unsafe" to accept the *Consensus* as a basis for an "objective" study of Calvin's "real" teaching.[145] Elsewhere he notes, regarding the *Consensus*, "upon the doctrine of the Eucharist, the formulations arrived at represented the maximum of what Calvin could admit, and one cannot take them as the basis for an equitable verdict upon his doctrine."[146]

---

[144] This would seem to imply that Calvin and Bullinger are not really distant from each other's concept of the presence.

[145] Wendel, *Calvin*, pp. 320-330.

Barclay, consistent with his attempt to establish one Protestant doctrine of the Lord's Supper, asserts that the articles, especially XVI-XVIII, show no indication of "accomodation", although they do not express the "full content" of Calvin's teaching. Calvin did not reject his position that the earthly elements are seals of a concurring action of Christ, not efficacious in their own right, in the Consensus.[147] On the other hand, Bullinger's opposition to "the deification of creaturely signs" was certainly upheld by Calvin and by the Consensus. Barclay concludes thus: "That he [Calvin] was led then to make concessions to the so-called Zwinglianism of Bullinger in any way is a pure chimera."[148]

Grass concurs in this view. While the full teaching of Calvin does not appear in the Consensus, it is unjust to assert that the Consensus reflects such major concessions on Calvin's part that it is worthless as a statement of his belief. He adduces four points to this effect.[149] First, at the beginning of the correspondence concerning a suggested

---

[146] Ibid., p. 343.

[147] Barclay, Protestant Doctrine, p. 172.

[148] Ibid. Barclay shores up his position by indicating that Calvin was anxious to join with Zürich in a joint statement on the Eucharist, but Bullinger was suspicious. He succeeded at the synod at Berne, 19 March, 1549, pp. 161ff.

[149] Grass, Abendmahlslehre, pp. 208-211.

Consensus, both men had many general points of agreement. Further, the correspondence between the two indicates that they exchanged viewpoints and suggested criticism before they met to decide on the content of the Consensus.[150] In this correspondence it appears, according to Grass, that the main difference between the two was that at first, Calvin had described the Sacrament as an instrument of grace, while Bullinger thought that this attributed too much to it. God granted his grace not through signs, but through faith and the Holy Spirit.[151] Bullinger is said to have been a bit suspicious about Calvin's assertion that the signs are not empty signs. But in the end he agreed.[152] Before moving to the second point, it is suggested that Grass makes too much of Calvin and Bullinger's supposed point of difference on the matter of the Holy Spirit's activity, the importance of faith, and the reality of both thing signified and sign. Evidence adduced above seems to indicate that they shared these concerns, though, since Bullinger is not a duplicate of Calvin, the emphasis varies between them.

Secondly Grass notes, with Barclay, that it was Calvin, not Bullinger, who wished the Consensus to be drawn up as an agreement.[153]

---

[150] Ibid. In an excursus, pp. 275-279, Grass adduces eleven items in the correspondence demonstrating these facts.

[151] Ibid., pp. 208-209.

[152] Ibid.

Thirdly, the basis for the Twenty-six Articles was the Twenty Articles of Calvin, which he had presented to the synod at Berne, March 1549.

Fourthly, Calvin defended the Consensus after it was published. His first two works against Westphal made a strong defence of the Consensus. He asserted that the Consensus was not a "conspiratio...ad stabiliendos errores: sed ingenua sententiae nostrae professio, quae tollendis offensionibus visa est optime congruere."[154]

With these points in mind, bald assertions that the Consensus Tigurinus is not a fair reflection of Calvin's doctrine seem misguided, and need strong qualification. Beyond the strength of Grass's arguments, it seems that the comparison we have suggested between Bullinger and Calvin on the action of the Holy Spirit, faith, the participation in Christ in the Supper--points essential to the doctrines of both--appear in pre-Consensus writings. They also appear in the Consensus itself. It is concluded that there is not sufficient reason to vitiate the authority of the Consensus Tigurinus, and thus to oppose the facts of an agreement on a very sensitive issue between two leaders of major protestant groups.

---

[153] "Bullinger liess die Sache ziemlich in sich herankommen. Er war misstrauisch durch die Schlechten Erfahrungen, die er mit Butzer gemachte hatte, und Butzer war ja seit Strassburg Calvin's Freund...." Ibid.

[154] Ibid.

If these conclusions be accepted, can we use the term "Zwinglianism" in 1549 and after justifiably? It appears to be misleading to do so. Dugmore seems on the one hand to accept the fact of the signing of the Consensus as introducing a strong element of doubt about the use of the term "Zwinglian". On the other, he asserts that Article X relapses into Zwinglianism.[155] Two comments seem to be necessary: (1) no conclusions as to the "Zwinglianism" of the Consensus, and therefore by implication the "Zwinglianism" of Calvin and Bullinger can stand on one article of the Consensus; (2) this article can surely be read to emphasize the promises of God, the context of faith in reception, and the reality of the signs.[156] In the context of our conclusions regarding the teachings of both Calvin and Bullinger, the article appears to be avoiding the statement that the signs themselves are not efficacious, as though they enclosed the body of Christ, a teaching present in both Reformers' writings previous to the signing of the Consensus. It is suggested that Dugmore's implications need not be accepted.

Zwinglianism is thus an outdated and misleading term after the signing of the Consensus Tigurinus.

The agreement was well received by some Reformers. McLelland argues that "Bullinger's theology was wholly acceptable to Calvin, whatever be our estimate of Zwingli, and therefore we have the fact of a doctrine practically identical with that of Martyr and Bucer."[157] Note also that Martyr wrote to Bullinger (25 April, 1551) and thanked him for a copy of "the agreement between yourself and Calvin upon the sacramentarian controversy."[158] Is it true that Bucer, Martyr, Calvin and Bullinger have a "practically identical", or even closely related doctrine of the presence of Christ? We move to a discussion of the former pair in order to explore this interesting possibility.

---

[155] Dugmore, Mass, pp. 161-162.

[156] Cf. above, p. 187.

---

[157] McLelland, Words, p. 37.

[158] Dugmore, Mass, p. 148.

Bucer and Peter Martyr

To conclude this presentation of the thoughts of the major Reformers in the context of the Eucharistic debate on the Continent, we move to a consideration of Martin Bucer and Peter Martyr Vermigli.

Martin Bucer is known as an arbitrator, an ecumenically-minded Reformer on the Continent. The tale of his activities on the Continent is one of bridge-building. As a "pontifex", it was necessary that he make contact with both banks in the Eucharistic debate. He was a tolerant worker with both Luther and Zwingli in the classic debate. Two comments, then, seem in order, before we begin an exposition of his Eucharistic thought, with special reference to the question of his concept of the presence of Christ in the Supper. First, he made Strassburg a refuge for almost every part of the spectrum of protestant thought.[1] Secondly, his activity in attempting to bring together the divergent view points of Luther and Zwingli-- and after the death of Zwingli, Zwinglians-- indicates continued compromise (though the word should be used with caution) between the two positions we have already discussed. Noting these points, we are not surprised to find diverging statements regarding the real presence of Christ in the Supper within the corpus of Bucer's writings. It seems proper, therefore, to begin this discussion with an account of the development of Bucer's teaching until approximately 1536. We end in 1536 for the likely reason that some stabilization of thought was achieved at this point, as will be shown.[2]

---

[1] Harbison speaks of Strassburg as "the most tolerant city in Europe until the late 1530's, a haven for religious refugees of every description", Reformation, p. 61.

Van De Poll notes that the Eucharist had always been a major concern of Bucer's: it was celebrated every Sunday, and was essential to the religious life through the confession of sin, absolution, and intercessions.[3] In 1523 Bucer wrote his Summa, in which he endeavoured to present to his readers the significance of the Sacrament. We find that he holds that the body of Christ is worshipped "sub pane", indicating some affinity to the Lutheran conception.[4] To this Summa he added the "Urschreiben sampt Artickeln", in which he describes the purified Mass as the sealing of the New Testament.

Other writings of this early period include the De Coena Dominica and the Grund und Ursach, in which he argues that this Sacrament is "a concession to the frailty of the human flesh; God does not bind his grace to material things."[5] At the same time Bucer appears to hold a concept of the spiritual eating of the body of Christ in faith. [6]

---

[2] We adopt here the work of Eells, Bucer, as the basis of this narrative, with additional help from Van De Poll, Ideas, et. al. This seems justifiable, since a definitive biography of Bucer is not proposed, but rather an account of his Eucharistic teachings as they may be said to effect the Continental and English Eucharistic debate. Eell's work appears to be the most thorough life of Bucer, although he allows himself to disapprove of some of Bucer's actions.

[3] Van De Poll, Ideas, p. 82. [4] Ibid.

Such a position appears to place Bucer outside of the Zwinglian camp in this early period. McDonnell avers that up to the end of the first half of 1524 Bucer was a Lutheran. The rest of 1524 was a period of doubt, and from 1525 to 1528 he accepted the position of Zwingli. "Bucerianism", or Bucer's distinctive doctrine, which we shall consider below, does not arise until the period following 1528.[7] In October 1524 Karlstadt visited Strassburg, though he did not contact Bucer himself. Nevertheless, he inclined to agree with Karlstadt's generally symbolist approach to the question of the relationship of the body of Christ to the elements. Another visitor to Strassburg in this early period was Hinne Rode, who brought with him the famous letter of Hoen. The letter appears to have had a marked impact on Bucer. He received soon after a letter from Zwingli, and accepted the statement of doctrine therein. Yet even during this period of Zwinglian influence, he attributed a greater value to the celebration of the Supper than that of a memorial service. But the corporal presence in a physical sense is rejected.[8]

---

[5] Ibid.

[6] This dualism between the realist presence and presence by faith, argues Van De Poll, "never drops altogether; in his English days it returns, when he further reflects on the concept 'Spirit' in the New Testament. The preparation and discipline require a realism together with the Spirit to counteract anabaptist extremes." Ibid.

[7] McDonnell, Calvin, pp. 75-76.

Eells suggests that Bucer had previously been convinced of the reception of the true body. In his _Summa_, he reminds his hearers,

> Remember what I have said to you several times of the mass; that it...is nothing else than the reception of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ .... It is clear that we receive his body and blood as did also his disciples.[9]

It is, then, this position, one which appears to be Lutheran, from which Bucer is drawn by the confrontation with Rode and the letter from Zwingli.

It is probable, despite some confusion over the early period of Bucer's Eucharistic doctrine, that by September 1525, Bucer was working actively for Zwingli and Oecolampadius. Luther wrote a rather harsh letter to Zwingli (November 1525) making it plain that he considered Zwingli a servant of the Devil because of his views on the Supper. Oecolampadius had published a polemic against Luther, his _Wahre und ächte Erklärung der Worte des Herrn: das ist mein Leib_, September 1525, and dedicated it to the Swabian sympathizers. . Bucer joined the dispute by writing to the Swabians, demanding that they accept Oecolampadius' views or refrain from replying. He informed a personal friend, Johannes Brenz, that Oecolampadius and Zwingli were unequalled in Germany. They were valiant leaders whom it would be "satanic" to condemn.[10] Further evidence of Bucer's presence in the Zwinglian group comes from his work with Bugenhagen's commentary on the Psalms. Bucer was asked to translate this work into German in 1526, and agreed. He discovered certain statements by Bugenhagen, in his explanation of Psalm 111:5, which were contrary to Bucer's belief. He substituted instead some rather more Zwinglian comments of his own. Bugenhagen was understandably aroused about this, as was Melanchthon, who had written an introductory essay for the work. Neither wished to have his name attached to Bucer's statements.[11]

---

[8] _Ibid_.

[9] Eells, _Bucer_, p. 70.

Bucer later contracted to translate Luther's homiletical expositions of the Gospels and the Pauline works for French and Italiam readers. Once more, he caused an uproar by adding to the translation a preface reflecting his own views. He made several significant comments. The bread and wine were only signs, and the Lord's Supper was a memoria of the death of Christ. He argued that on the sum of the teaching of the Supper, all were agreed, and there was no need for the strife which was brewing.[12] Further, he also noted in the preface that he had claimed nothing contradictory to the teaching of Bugenhagen in his translation of the commentary. True, he did champion the symbolic view in that he asserted that Christ was in heaven, and thus could not be present in the elements physically. On the other hand, he asserted that Christ was omnipresent by "his virtue", and that Christ was truly eaten by faith.[13]

---

[10] Bucer alienated Brenz by his action here, and Brenz appears henceforth as an opponent of Zwingli, Eells, Bucer, p. 75. Eells appears to be mistaken, when he states, with reference to the growing controversy over the Eucharist, "It was a question now of who was the greatest in the kingdom of heaven, Luther or Zwingli; not merely of whether Christ was bodily or symbolically present in the Supper." Bucer, p. 73. The question of the presence remained uppermost in the minds of the disputants, as may be deduced from previous statements.

[11] Ibid., pp. 77-78.

Eells states that while Bucer agreed with Zwingli on the matters of flesh against spirit, the translation of "est" by "significat", and the belief in spiritual participation, he disagreed on other points. His tendency to attribute a great importance to the Eucharist has already been noted, as well as his conception of the service as a memoria, but not only a memoria. Moreover, though he regards the words as unable to transform the elements into the body and blood of Christ, and views the elements as symbols, they are not empty symbols. Without explaining himself fully, he asserted that as bread fed the external body, so the body of Christ nourished the spirit by faith.[14] This distinction, viewed in light of what has already been discussed about Calvin, and the later Reformation generally, is important. But it was no distinction at all for Luther. Bucer was a Zwinglian to him, and remained so.[15]

---

[12] Ibid., p. 80.

[13] Ibid., p. 83; cf. p.84.

[14] Ibid., p. 86.

Despite these differences with Zwingli, he still worked actively for the Zwinglian group. He is known to present historians as a conciliator, an arbitrator. But until he began searching for means to bring Zwingli and Luther together, he was an active Zwinglian. At the Disputation of Berne, 1528, Bucer made his position clear by joining Zwingli and Oecolampadius in the defense of the fourth proposition:

> That the body and blood of Christ are actually and bodily received in the bread of the eucharist may not be proved from Scripture.[16]

1528, however, was the time of change in Bucer's position which is most important to us. Luther's Vom Abendmal Christi. Bekenntnis Mart. Luther, which we have examined, was the source of this shift. Bucer read the Confession, and discovered that he had been misinterpreting Luther. He had thought that Luther affirmed a corporal presence of Christ in the Supper which was identical with that of the Roman arguments.

---

[15] On the other hand, as late as his visit to England, shortly before he died there, he was still considered a Lutheran by the radicals.

[16] Eells, Bucer, pp. 86-87. Eells notes that Bucer later claimed that he was merely attempting to demonstrate the falsity of the cruder formulas of Luther and others, and in reality asserted as true the idea of the real spiritual presence. But the company he kept at the time meant more to the opposition than what he said. Ibid.

He now discovered that Luther affirmed something quite different, namely, what Luther called--as Bucer saw it-- a "sacramental union". That is to say, Bucer understood Luther to say that Christ and the elements were joined together in the Supper, though not in the crass corporal fashion of the Romans. Bucer, struck with this discovery, wrote to Oecolampadius, Vadianus, and Zwingli, informing them of this point, and urging them to take account of it in the future. Apparently, Bucer was misunderstood. Luther, taking the position that Bucer was undermining his teaching, strongly censured the Strassburger for his new "virulence" against the truth of the Gospel. Zwingli and his followers, on the other hand, viewed Bucer's statement of his findings from the *Confession*, and the arguments for future harmony drawn therefrom--which appeared in his *Vergleichung D. Luthers. und seins gegentheyls. vom Abendmal Christi*--as a new attack on Luther. The result of the argument was not, as Bucer thought and hoped, a new diplomatic strategy for the unification of two groups who ultimately agreed, but the appearance of a third group, who held Bucer's discovery as a separate teaching from Zwingli and Luther. This conclusion was not obvious to Bucer. From 1528 he began his non-partisan efforts for a statement of concord on the Supper. During this period he championed the belief in what he called the "true" presence.[17]

---

[17] *Ibid*., p. 90.

These actions gave Bucer the reputation of being an unreliable compromiser. By the time of the Colloquy at Marburg, 4 October 1529, this reputation was well-established. He was thought to have vacillated between the Lutheran and Zwinglian positions to the point that he could not be trusted by either side. To remove this impression, Bucer attempted to elicit promises for cooperation and concord from the individual participants at the Colloquy. With Justus Jonas he came to agreement on every question of the Colloquy but the one that mattered, the presence of Christ in the Supper. On 5 October, he conceded to Brenz and Osiander, in a private conference, that Christ's body was in the Supper and was given in and through the bread to believers. This agreement looked hopeful, until in the end Bucer himself weakened, and would not continue to support the position, at least according to Osiander. Bucer's conciliatory attitude appears to have attracted sympathy from Oecolampadius and Zwingli for a brief time. After the Colloquy itself had ended, they both offered to unite with Luther on the formula that "Christ is truly present and eaten by believers in the Supper."[18] Bucer met Melanchthon in Luther's own room and persuaded him to accept the phrase, the "true" presence.

These hopeful beginnings of unity were destroyed ten days later when the Schwabach Articles were presented to Protestant nobles by George of Brandenburg.

---

[18] *Ibid.*, pp. 94-95.

The Articles included a very Lutheran statement on the presence of Christ in the Supper. The Articles in question were composed by Luther, with the help of Jonas and Brenz, et. al., before the Marburg Colloquy was held. So uncompromising was the position taken that neither Zürich nor Strassburg could accept them.[19] Bucer criticised the Articles severly. This criticism, argues Eells, marks Bucer's last stand as a Zwinglian partisan. Henceforth, he decided that he would meet Luther "halfway". Such a meeting meant the end of his active Zwinglian career.

The Diet of Augsburg, 1530, was occasion for friendly discussions between Melanchthon and Bucer. They came to agreement on the use of the words"truly", "really", "essentially", and even "bodily". That Bucer was working for peace, and not Zwingli, becomes evident at this point. He confessed in these discussions that he could not agree with Zwingli on the matter of Christ's local presence in heaven. Christ was present in heaven, admitted Bucer, but this condition did not prevent him from being present elsewhere as well.[20]

Thus encouraged, Bucer attempted a formula of concord of his own, after conferences with Luther and Zwingli. It appeared in the"Open Letter to Duke Ernest of Brunswick-Lüneberg." He asserted that both sides had approved the following statement: "That the true body and the true blood of Christ were truly present in the Supper and are received with words of the Lord and the sacrament." This seemed to imply that the clergyman administered the signs, while God administered the true bread of heaven, Christ. The body and blood were not enclosed in the elements, which were signs.[21] He further pointed out that Zwingli and Oecolampadius did not teach that only the elements were present; rather, they insisted that there was no change in the elements. Luther, too, denied a change in the elements, though insisting that the elements were not _signa nuda_. Bucer argued that the difference in the two positions was one of emphasis, not of substance.

---

[19] The Schwabach Articles were later taken as the basis for the Augsburg Confession.

[20] Eells, Bucer, p. 106.

Neither Luther nor the Zwinglians concurred. The attempt of 1530 failed. True, Bucer himself was acceptable to Luther. The latter was probably impressed with the construction of the formula. What was demonstrated, however, so far as Luther was concerned, was that while Bucer could be drawn into the fold, Zwingli and Oecolampadius never would.[22]

Eells notes the appearance of a Bucerian party in the Rhine and Danube valleys, which thought of itself as yet a third party in the Protestant debate. Bucer wrote to a gathering of these sympathizers in February 1531. He asserted that there was more in the Supper than mere bread and wine. This "more" was the presence of the body of Christ as food for the spirit.

---

[21] _Ibid_., p. 112.

[22] _Ibid_., p. 116.

The participant received the spiritual refreshment of the body and blood of Christ. On the other hand, the body and blood were not directly related to the elements in the sense that the corporal body was present under the elements. Christ's body was still locally in heaven. A spiritual presence seems to have been meant here.[23]

Bucer wished to advance this doctrine as the basis for concord, though past experience threw up an overwhelming case against such hopes. He did not accede to defeat, however. 3 March, 1534, Bucer wrote his *Bericht Kirchen zu Münster*, during the siege against Jan of Leyden, who had set himself up as ruler of that city. At the end of the letter, he asserted that the Zwinglians and the Lutherans fundamentally agreed on the matter of the presence of Christ in the Supper. He suggested a formula of concord:

> We believe and confess that the Lord gives us his true body and his true blood, not as food for the stomach and therefore in a fleshly manner, like other bodily foods, but in such a divine way that the Lord truly lives in us and we in him and are truly partakers of his body and his members, and so of his kind and nature.[24]

Again, nothing came of this suggestion.

Bucer's last effort at proclaiming a statement of reconciliation appears on 22 July, 1536, in his *Retractions*, a statement of recantations which Luther demanded as a precursor to concord. Bucer defended his foregoing efforts for peace. Finally, he did not retract a belief in the signa nuda, but asserted that he had never held it.[25]

---

[23] *Ibid*., p. 117.

[24] *Ibid*., p. 161.

This lame effort at bringing Luther and Zürich together failed utterly, and demonstrated that the case for unity was lost. But our major concern is with Bucer himself. What can we say of his doctrine of the presence of Christ in the Supper at the end of this pilgrimage toward concord? Eells believes that in 1536 he was neither a Lutheran nor a Zwinglian.[26] This must mean that his doctrine was different from both, or yet a third teaching of the presence of Christ in the Supper. This conclusion seems sound. Having accepted the proposition that Bucer taught a different understanding of the presence, it is proposed that we attempt now to present that concept, drawing upon sources appearing not only after 1534, but also before.

That Bucer opposed the teaching of the corporal presence, as well as transubstantiation, is clear from the very beginning of his work as a Reformer. We note that even as early as 1524, when a questionnaire was sent to other european Reformers from Strassburg, he took a strong stand on the matter. He found nothing requiring the corporal presence in the classical treatments. He adduced such comparable symbolical texts as "I am the vine", and "Thou art Peter" to defend his symbolical understanding of the words of institution. In 1524 Bucer argued that the presence of the carnal Christ was both impossible and useless:

---

[25] Ibid., p. 210.

[26] Ibid., p. 212.

"impossible because Christ in the flesh was at the right hand of God, being omnipresent only in the spirit; useless because the essential requirement for salvation and a proper observance of the Supper was faith in Christ."[27]

In his Vergleichung of 1528, in which he argued for the essential unity of Zwingli's and Luther's positions, Bucer presented his arguments in the form of a dialogue between two characters, Sebold and Arbogast. Arbogast represents Bucer's opinions.[28] In the course of the dialogue, Sebold is won over to the opinion of Arbogast, though the former is clearly of a Lutheran persuasion. One of the points of Arbogast's argument is that the corporal presence ought to be rejected by Sebold. In the Summa at the end of the work, Sebold sums up Arbogast's arguments, and apparently agrees with them:

> Seb.:.... Nůn aber, wo man dise wort [Das ist mein leib] wolte verstehn, das durch sie das brot im abentmal Christi zům leib Christi leiblich würde und also yedes tyl Brots warer leib Christi leiblich sein solte, so were yetz der leib Christi zůmal mehr dann an eym ort leiblich und wesenlich und also yetzt nit nůr eyn sonder vil leib.

The objection to such teaching is that it is contrary to the human nature of Christ. Even in the first Supper,

---

[27] Ibid., pp. 72-73.

[28] Martini Buceri Opera Omnia, Series I; Deutsche Schriften, Band 2: Schriften der Jahre 1524-1528, ed. Robert Stupperich (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1960-); pp. 295-383.

Christ was present in his complete humanity, sitting with his disciples. He was not corporeally present in each piece of the bread which the disciples ate.[29]

The arguments from the human nature of Christ and christology in general are the basis of Bucer's rejection of the corporal presence, and thus of transubstantiation. They will be noted in another section. They appear here, nonetheless. The true humanity of Christ at the Last Supper dictated that it was impossible for him to be present in the bread. Thus the words of institution, as they were first spoken, must mean something other than that Christ is corporally limited to the bread.

> Arbogast:.... Also nun, so der Herr gesprochen hat dise wort: *Das ist mein leib* etc., bliebe er bey seynen Jüngeren leiblich sitzen. Were nun das brot auch sein warer leib leiblich gewesen, so hette er zwen leib gehebt. Dann ye auch das sein leib war, der bey den Jüngeren sass und ihn das brot reychte. Das mag aber nit sein. Christus ist eyn warer mensch und hat eyn eynigen waren menschlichen leib. Darumb haben die Jünger als wenig verstanden, das er gemeynt hette, das das brot sein leib leiblich sein, als wenn solche wort S. Peter oder eyn ander Jünger geredt hette. So dann auss disem klar ist, das der Herr nit gemeynt hat, das das brot sein leib leiblich were, und doch gesagt, es sey sein leib, so gebürt sich ye eyn andre dann die leiblich weise in der schrifft zů sůchen, auff die man dise wort verstande.[30]

Arbogast makes a similar point soon after:

Arbo.: Wolan, so antwort mir auff das argument:

---

[29] *Ibid*., pp. 380-381. [30] *Ibid*., p. 323.

> Christus was warer mensch, darumb hat er nůr eyn leib. Wenn er abur nu, da er vom brot sagt: *das ist mein leib etce.* [sic] hette wollen verstehn, das das brot were sein leib leiblich gewesen so hette er zwen leib gehebt; eynen das brot, den andern der das brot reychte. Das ist nu wider alle schrifft, die im nůr eynen und eyn waren menschlichen leib zůgeben.[31]

Sebold replies that if God wishes it so to be, then it is. God is omnipotent, and the bread can be the body of Christ if God wishes it. Bucer the arbitrator is evident in the reply to Sebold. Arbogast states that the body of Christ is the bread "sacramentally", but not corporally. If someone says that the emperor is physically present, no one understands anything different than that he is present in his own body. Therefore, if you understand Christ to mean that he gives his own body to the disciples at the Last Supper, then you must also understand that he has two bodies, one in the bread and one that offers it. This is completely contrary to all scripture, which tells us that Christ is truly human.[32] The argument seems sufficiently clear: Bucer cannot accept the corporal presence of Christ in the Supper, since it does not do justice to the true humanity of Christ.

Further opposition to the corporal presence, and by implication to transubstantiation, appears in the Wittenberg Concordia of 1536. Bucer wrote that with the bread and wine which is offered is also presented, really and truly, the body and blood of Christ the Lord, both God and man. But,

---

[31] *Ibid*., pp. 325-326. [32] *Ibid*., p. 326.

> We deny that transubstantiation takes place, or a "localis inclusio", or that a lasting union is meant between the elements and body and blood of Christ; but we admit that on the strength of a sacramental union the bread is the body of Christ.[33]

Strype prints Bucer's "Sententious Sayings" on the matter of the Lord's Supper;[34] and from these we take evidence of Bucer's continuing conviction of the falsity of the corporal presence, with special emphasis on his christological implications. Christ dwells in heaven, and thus cannot be corporally on earth. The word was made flesh in order that God and man might be made one. The earthly Christ lived, died, and ascended to the right hand of the father, who rules and governs all things, whence Christ shall come to judge the living and the dead. When, nevertheless, we speak of Christ's presence with us in the Supper, we must not oppose that presence by asserting that he has departed this world, or by saying that his body is bounded by a certain place. Yet by the same token it cannot be argued that the body is limited to the elements.[35]

---

[33] Van De Poll, Ideas, p. 87. The point of this quotation is the rejection of the concepts of transubstantiation and the corporal presence, but not that a real presence is unimportant to Bucer. We shall see that he is fully committed to the concept of a real presence, though he has rejected a corporal presence--and largely for this reason we are pressed into allowing to Bucer the position of a third party in the Eucharistic debate on the Continent, an important point.

[34] Strype, Memorials, II, pp. 855-869.

[35] Ibid., sayings 15 and 19; vs. transubstantiation, cf. saying 51.

Some have imagined that Christ is limited to the Sacrament, that he is

> presently geven, receyved and had, [and they] do imagyne a certaine presence of place, and many tymes they fantsye also, that god himself is founded in a place, havyng a body, even as he were a man.[36]

These must be instructed that Christ is not limited to a place, whether it be heaven or whether it be the elements. For these are heavenly "misteries" which surpass man's capacity to understand. They can only be comprehended in the light of the word of God. Christ is not to be sought for in bodily fashion, in the body in which he departed this world. Rather he is to be found as he desires to present himself to us, being in heaven. This is a matter of faith, not of reason.[37]

On the other hand, Christ is also present among us:

> This we know by the wordes of Christ: where two or three be gathered in my name, ther am I in the mydst of them. In the name of Christ we assemble together at the Lords Supper rightly ministred. In the world we be, yea and somewhere placed, wheresoever we be, Christ is among us, which notwithstanding is not in the world and also dwelleth in our hartes.[38]

The christological implications were not lost on the younger Bucer of the *Vergleichung*. Christ is in heaven, and will not be brought down to earth.

---

[36] *Ibid.*, saying 24.

[37] *Ibid.*, saying 25

[38] *Ibid.*, saying 33.

We ascend to him.

> Arbo.: So sagten die Engel: *Der Jesus, der von euch genommen ist in hymel, derselbig wört kommen, wie ir in habt gesehen in den hymel faren*. Sindt das nit helle wort? *Der Jesu*, sagten sie, *der von euch in hymel auffgenommen ist*. Ist er nun im hymel auffgenommen, so ist er dorben und nit hie. Er wört nit anders kommen, dann wie die junger in haben gsehen hyngaren.[39]

Again, Arbogast makes his argument for the presence of Christ in heaven, and thus absence of Christ on earth, after the physical mode. Scripture, he says, never asserts that Christ is physically present in more than one place at one time. Thus the disciples saw him ascend to heaven, whence, said the angel, he would return. Thus also did Paul say that we celebrate the Supper, until he comes. If we would understand scripture correctly, we must know that the body of Christ is in a heavenly place, not corporally present on earth.[40]

In this apparently Zwinglian emphasis, christological considerations led Bucer to a clear denial of the corporal presence. Twenty-three years later, the other side of the coin was evident. Christ may not be present, says Bucer in his *Censura*, "secundum praesentiam carnis, but remains with us secundum divinam naturam, secundum virtutem, secundum spiritum."[41] The emphasis is now on a positive affirmation of the manner in which Christ is present with us not only in the Supper, but also united with us as father and son:

---

[39] Stupperich, *Schriften*, p. 340.

[40] *Ibid*., p. 322, and cf. p. 321.

[41] Van De Poll, *Ideas*, pp. 88-89.

> In the Eucharist we receive the communion and the unity with the Father and Son and all the saints..., for which reason Christ will dwell in us, as the Father dwells in him. But this unity and communion is too mysterious for the brain to comprehend.[42]

There is, nevertheless, no descent of Christ from heaven. His place is in heaven, he cannot be physically in the Supper. Therefore it is not the physical Christ which is present in the elements:

> Nulla tamen his praesentia Domini localis vel circumscriptiva ponitur; quare nihil de descensu Domini e coelis hic cogitandum...sed nec in coelis Dominis certe loco includitur.[43]

Given these conclusions regarding the person of Christ, Bucer perforce accepted a non-literal understanding of the words of institution.[44] This implication was apparently clear to him in 1526, when he translated Bugenhagen's commentary. He was inclined to agree with Karlstadt on this one point, namely, that Christ was present in the Supper only in the Spirit, and that "impanatio" on the order of Lutheran orthodoxy was out of the question.[45] In the same year he published his *Apologia Martini Buceri qua fidei suae atque doctrinae, circa Christi Coenam*, etc., in which he argues for a tropical or figurative meaning of the words of institution.[46]

---

[42] *Ibid*. [43] *Ibid*., p. 89.

[44] Cf. McDonnell, *Calvin*, p. 73.

[45] Van Der Poll, *Ideas*, p. 82. [46] *Ibid*.

The acceptance of the symbolical position led inexorably to a conclusion drawn from Bucer's concept of the presence, namely, that one could not identify the elements of the Supper with the corporal body of Christ. Sasse notes that in the years 1530 and following, Bucer never gave up his "protest against any theory which would, more or less, identify the elements with the body and blood."[47] Indeed, given his arguments regarding the presence of Christ's body in heaven, he could not affirm such an identity.

On the other hand, as has been apparent already, Bucer has a strong sense of the presence of Christ in the Supper, especially in his post-Zwinglian years. He does assert a link between the elements and Christ. "The symbols are not 'inanis', but speak their language."[48] At the Cassel conference, 28 December, 1534, Bucer agreed to the statement produced by the conference, and signed it with Melanchthon. The Cassel Formula asserted that

> the bread and wine were signa exhibitiva with which were received at the same time the body and blood of Christ; and that the union of the bread and body was of such a kind that "they are one, not with a mixture of their natures, but as a sacrament,

---

[47] Sasse, Body, p. 307, and cf. Sebold's summary, Stupperich, Schriften, p. 382.

[48] Van De Poll, Ideas, p. 83. Cf. McDonnell, Calvin, p. 77: "If his [Bucer's] ideas had not changed, his expression of them and the policies he based on them did. What was unchanged was his contention that the elements were symbols with the addition of some form of divine presence."

> and each one is given together with the sacrament in such a way that what is posited of one may be posited of the other."[49]

Bucer's concern for attributing to the signs more than a mere signification seems clearly discernible. Nevertheless, he would not refuse all "tropical" explanations of the status of the elements, for as we have seen, such a refusal would open the door to a reintroduction of the "papistical" error of the Supper as an external work without faith.[50]

Bucer's concern for a definite link between the elements and the body of Christ, as well as the dominance of his concept of real participation in Christ, can be seen in comments on union with Christ in the Eucharist. Christ is present in the Supper in a real fashion, from Bucer's point of view, to the extent that he says, "eum realiter et substantialiter adesse."[51] He does not mean, however, that Christ is food for the stomach, but rather that we participate in Christ, are joined to him, in a--one can hardly use another word--corporal fashion: "Regeneratione enim facti sumus membra corporis eius, caro de carne eius, os de ossibus eius, et una cum ipso caro...."[52] This very definite understanding of the union with Christ is carried through to his English period. From the "Sententious Sayings" we take the following:

---

[49] Eells, Bucer, p. 177. Eells notes that though Bucer attempted to explain his acceptance of this statement to Martin Frecht of Ulm, "the plain fact was that he had made a confession for the Lutherans and an explanation for the Zwinglians, which only a distorted interpretation could reconcile." pp. 177-178.

[50] Constantin Hopf, *Martin Bucer and the English Reformation* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1946), p. 46.

[51] Van De Poll, *Ideas*, p. 89. [52] *Ibid*., from the correspondence with Schwarz, Calvin, Brenz, and Hardenberg.

> That fellowship which we have with the father and the sonne, and with all the sayntes, whereof S. John speaketh,...is geven and taken in the Lords Supper rightly admynistred and receyved. That unity also which we have with the father, and the sonne, and with all the saints, for the which the Lord prayed,...by the which Christ is in us, as the father is in him, and we theym, (Imeane in the father the sonne) is geven and receyved in the same supper rightly administered, wherof the Lord also speaketh: "he that eateth my flesh and drincketh my bloud dwelleth in me, and I in him"[53]

Such union with Christ is predicated on faith. Bucer's insistence on faith, says Hopf, is the touchstone of his teaching. His insistence on faith as the controlling factor in reception enables him to affirm the centrality of faith as well as a true reception of Christ in the elements.[54] Bucer writes to Martyr, June 1549:

> For, though we should grant you, that He is circumscribed even in heaven by a physical place, how is that inconsistent with His being now truly present to us by faith; even as the sun, in whatever

---

[53] Strype, Memorials, II, pp. 855-869, saying 8.

[54] Hopf, Bucer, p. 44. Hopf contends that Bucer's attempts to avoid controversy and achieve unity were based on "repeated and constant stress on Christ's presence by faith." Thus he replies to the difficulties of transubstantiation, the relation of the elements to the body, and the matter of ubiquity, by insisting on the approach to the Sacrament by faith. Faith is indeed crucial to Bucer's concept of the presence of Christ. His argument is, that we participate in, we receive Christ, in the Supper by faith. And by faith, we receive the true Christ.

> part of the world we behold him, is truly present to us by signs. Certainly all errors which can possibly rise from the name 'Presence', may be altogether excluded by such words.... I have never felt disposed, nor am I up to this moment disposed, to come forward in that controversy.[55]

Faith is thus the condition through which the whole Christ is present in the Supper.

It is interesting to note, with Van De Poll, a difference caused by the role of faith in Bucer's teaching between himself and Luther. Luther granted omnipotence to the Verbum Dei, to create whatever it would, and thus to bring the body of Christ into the elements. Bucer, too, accepted this point; but he further argued that the Verbum Dei is omnipotent only insofar as it is believed. Thus the efficacy of the word--here the words of institution--is dependent on the faith of the recipient. Luther had insisted that Christ is present in the elements not because we believe him to be, but because the words "Hoc est corpus meum" demand it. To deny such a presence is to deny the truth of scripture. Bucer, on the other hand, could never wholeheartedly accept the manducatio impiorum.[56]

What the faithful receive, however, is the body and blood of Christ. Bucer believes in a real presence which is real indeed, but only for those with faith. The presence is not effected by the words of institution spoken over the elements, but in virtue of the faith which is "determined by the words of institution."[57] Thus the body of Christ is truly present--not, however, by mechanical operation of divine power, but with the concurrence of faith. Calvin and Bucer share this emphasis on faith as a controlling factor in the matter of the presence.

---

[55] Ibid., p. 48.

[56] Van De Poll, Ideas, p. 45.

We see this emphasis in the "Sententious Sayings":

> For Christes presence, whether it be offered or declared, eyther in the word onely or els in the sacramentes, is no presence of place neyther of senses nor of reason, nor yet no yearthly presence, but it is a spiritual presence, a presence of faith, and a heavenly presence.

Here note the similarity to Calvin's analogy of rising up to Christ in the Supper:

> For as much as we are conveyde into heaven by faith, beyng placed in Christ. So that we lay hold ypon him and embrace him in his heavenly majestye, all be it he be here offered and declared after a sorte unto us in the glasse, and darke speaking of sensyble words and sacramentes.[58]

Again,

> Let them therfore that be apt to learne, be taught that ther is no presence of Christ in the supper, but onely in the lawful use therof, and such as is obtayned and gotten by fayth onely.[59]

Further, wherever we be in the world, Christ is with us. We know this not by reason but by faith. Thus Bucer defines the presence of Christ, whether it be in Sacraments or by the word of the Gospel, as "onely the attainyng and perceyving of the commodities we have in Christ both God and man", who dwells in us. The presence is not obtained by human means, but is had by faith and the fruits thereof offered to us in the word and in the Sacraments.

---

[57] McDonnell, Calvin, p. 83.

[58] Strype, Memorials, II, pp. 855-869, saying 20.

[59] Ibid., saying 22.

Bucer would prefer to eliminate from the discussion of the Sacrament the words realiter, and substantialiter. However, if they are to be used, they must be defined in terms of faith.

> ...I would, for the maintenance of Christes truth against the adversaries, among the children of God, defyne these words realiter and substantialiter, as if one would understand by the presence of the Lord really and substantially, that he is received verely in dede by faith, and his substaunce is geven in the sacrament.[60]

That Christ is really present in the Supper, even after the fashion of the words realiter and substantialiter, is heartily affirmed by Bucer--on the condition of faith as the controlling factor.

Given the important role of faith, we do participate in Christ:

> we say that the partaking of Christ, which we have in baptisme, is strengthened and augmented in the Lordes supper. But we will say the same is done, what time the gospell being read, or heared, is received by faith.[61]

Bucer, furthermore, makes his concept of faith, as it applies in the reception of Christ in the Supper, clear, saying that in faith in the love of God we have everlasting life. This faith is in the merits and benefits of Christ which accrue to us. It is nourished in the Supper by the signs of bread and wine, which God chose for this purpose. Thus Christ gives his flesh "spiritually to be eaten by the sign of the bread", and his blood to be drunk spiritually when we consume the elements.[62] Note here a further similarity to Calvin's understanding of faith. Faith is the fruit of the Supper. On the other hand, faith in the action of God in Christ is a controlling factor in the reception of Christ: thus the Supper is enacted with reference to the recipient, to whom the true Christ is given:

---

[60] Ibid., saying 39.

[61] Ibid., saying 42.

> Neither receiveth he any thing at all of that food which the Lord geveth to his, that taketh in hand to eate and drincke these sacraments without a lyvely faith in Christ, but receyveth death and dampnation to himself.[63]

The denial of the corporal presence by means of transubstantiation, or by inclusion of the body of Christ in the elements on the one hand, and the assertion of faith as the controlling factor of participation on the other, bring Bucer to a statement of the real presence of Christ in the Supper--a statement of belief in a definite link between the elements and the body. We therefore come to an examination of Bucer's affirmation of the real presence, recalling the context we have described.

The Tetrapolitana of 1530, which Bucer

---

[62] Ibid., saying 46.

[63] Ibid., saying 48.

subscribed, states:

> That the Lord, as in His Last Supper, also today, in this sacrament gives to His disciples and to the faithful, when they celebrate this Holy Supper, His true body and true blood truly to eat and to drink, according to His words: Take, eat, this is my body, etc., drink all of it, this is my blood, etc., as food for their souls and for eternal life.[64]

That the true reception of the true body and blood of Christ is the point stressed here cannot be doubted. Already in 1530, Bucer asserted the presence of the body. We have noted that he had always held a different concept from Zwingli on the matter of the signs as signa nuda. From this point, he begins to assert openly that the reception of the body and blood of Christ is what occurs in the Supper. The Wittenberg Concord of 1536 proclaims such an understanding. Bucer, Melanchthon, and some of the Zwinglian party (though not all) agreed to the following statement:

> They confess...the eucharist is composed of two things, an earthly and a heavenly. Thus they believe and teach, that the body and blood of Christ is truly and substantially present, offered, and taken with the bread and wine. And although they deny that transubstantiation takes place, they do not believe a local inclusion in the bread is effected, or any lasting union outside the use of the sacrament, yet they grant that by a sacramental union, the bread is the body of Christ, that is, they believe that, when the bread is proffered, the body of Christ is at the same time present and truly offered.[65]

The Strassburg Litany, in which Bucer's hand is apparent, indicates his thoughts on the manner of the "manducatio", and thus his concept of the presence of Christ. In the third intercessory prayer, we read,

---

[64] Sasse, Body, p. 305.

[65] Eells, Bucer, p. 292.

> ...und wie uns derselbig sein blut nit alleyn dir für unsere sünd am creutz uffgeopfferet hat, sonder will dasselbig uns auch zur speisa und tranck geben ins ewig leben, das wir...dise seine gute und geschencke uffnemmen und mit warem glauben ietzund empfahen und niessen sein waren leib und wares blut, ja in selbs, unseren heyland, waren gott und menschen, das einig ware himmelbrot, uff das...er in uns und wir inn jm leben....[66]

The heavenly gift is essential; and this is not a mere remembrance of Christ, nor abstract spirit or power, but Christ himself, "realis ac ipsius substantiae." The true body and blood, the "totus Christus" is given.[67] Thus, when Luther and Bullinger renewed the controversy over the Eucharist in 1544, Bucer, though drawn into it against his will, stated, " I thank the Lord, I prefer to die rather than embrace the doctrine that in the Supper only a memorial of the absent Christ is celebrated."[68] For Bucer, the true communion of the body and blood of Christ is the core of the Supper. His Strassburg Litany prays

> that with true faith we may keep this Supper of thy dear Son..., so that we verily receive and enjoy the true communion of His body and blood, of our Saviour Himself, who is the only saving bread of heaven.[69]

---

[66] Van De Poll, Ideas, pp. 91-92. [67] Ibid., p. 88.

[68] Eells, Bucer, p. 354.

[69] Bard Thompson, Liturgies, p. 173.
(Cleveland: The World Publishing Company (Meridian Books), 1961), p. 173.

Though he was generally favorable to the Consensus Tigurinus, Bucer did make some sharp criticisms which indicate that he would prefer a stronger statement on the question of true communion with Christ. He is considerably disturbed that the complete participation in Christ in the Supper is not so forcefully put as he would wish it.[70] It is probably such statements as these which determined the opinions of Bucer's contemporaries in England. None of them considered him a "Zwinglian", and most thought of him as a Lutheran, as did Gardiner. A letter to Calvin, written Whitsunday 1550, indicates the kind of opinion in question:

> We must observe in addition to these evils, that not a few persons, laying aside all desire after true repentance,...do nothing but dispute and contend, and often very profanely, how they may seclude Christ our Saviour from our sacraments and holy assemblies, and confine him to his place in heaven.[71]

Bucer feared this trend, it appears from this letter; for while he saw the weakness of the scholastic arguments for the presence, he could not deny the presence, though he might deny conclusions drawn from speculation on the power of the body of Christ to be present everywhere. The denial of the real presence of Christ was for Bucer a dangerous and erroneous position.

---

[70] Cf. McLelland, Words, pp. 272-273.

[71] Hopf, Bucer, pp. 49-50. Hopf cites the letter of A' Lasco to Bullinger, 10 April, 1551, as evidence for the opinion of some English Reformers that Bucer believes in the real, presumably meaning corporal, presence. Hopf further notes that Bucer moved to a more radical stance soon before his death, asserting a far weaker concept of the presence of Christ in the Supper. But this change came too late to exercise any "material influence." Ibid.

The "Sententious Sayings" provide a summary of Bucer's thought on the true participation of the body and blood of Christ:

> And he defyneth or describeth the right use and receyving of this Sacrament to be that partaking of the body and bloud of Christ, wereby we beyng many, are one bread and one body (as many of us as be partakers of one Bread and one Cup of the Lord.) This body doubtles is that body wherof Christ is the head, into which we are baptised. For by the regeneration we are made members of his body, flesh of his flesh, bone of his bones, and so we be one flesh with him....[72]

As we have seen with Calvin, Bucer's denial of the corporal inclusion of Christ in the elements, and his unequivocal statement affirming the true presence of Christ, controlled by faith, presents us with the question of the means by which one participates in the true body and true blood of Christ. How indeed is Christ present in the Supper according to Bucer's argument, if not corporally?

Richardson indicates that Bucer at times falls back on the classical Reformation metaphor of the sun and its rays:

> As the sun is truly placed...in one place of the visible heaven, and yet is truly everywhere in the world abroad: so our Lord, although he be comprehended in one place of the secret and divine heaven ...yet nevertheless, by his word and holy tokens he

---

[72] Strype, Memorials, II, pp. 855-869, saying 7. Previous comments indicated that while Bucer can mean the church here as the body of Christ, he must also mean that participation in the elements is participation in the body and blood of Christ.

> is...present truly whole God and man, and therefore in substance in his Holy Supper.[73]

Yet further explanation, not just metaphor, is suggested by Bucer. By the action of the Holy Spirit, we participate in the body and blood of Christ in the Supper. Van De Poll argues that Bucer assumes a _manducatio spiritualis_, after the manner of Calvin. His opinion was that the _manducatio spiritualis_ occurred through the twin operations of the Holy Ghost and faith.[74] In a nutshell, Van De Poll has summed up the two halves of the means by which Christ is present and received in the Supper. On the one hand, we note the action of the Holy Spirit. On the other, we see faith, by which we not only receive Christ, but, according to the above quotation from the "Sententious Sayings", we are raised up to Christ.[75] Our concern now is with the former of these two elements, the action of the Holy Spirit. But it should not be forgotten that the elevation to Christ by faith, the controlling factor of reception, is the other.

The action of the Holy Spirit in bringing Christ to his followers appears in Bucer's _Vergleichung_ of 1528:

> Arbogast: Doch wie die sonn leiblich und wesenlich nůr im hymelischen wesen, dannen er künfftig ist zům Gericht. Durch sein geyst und krafft aber ist er allenthalb, besonder aber bey den seinen.[76]

---

[73] C. C. Richardson, _Zwingli and Cranmer on the Eucharist_ (Cranmer Dixit et Contradixit) (Evanston: Seabury-Western, 1949),p.24.

[74] Van De Poll, _Ideas_, p. 90.

[75] Cf. Strype, _Memorials_, II, pp. 855-869, saying 20.

[76] Stupperich, _Schriften_, p. 381.

Bucer's commentary on the Gospel of John reflects a belief in the action of the Spirit in the Eucharistic context. Commenting on John 6:54, Bucer argues that the Supper affords the reception of Christ only when Christ's Spirit is present. But in and through the Spirit Christ is really there. "The possession of the Spirit is the condition for the knowledge of Word and Sacrament."[77] Furthermore, the Spirit elicits faith, and thus accomplishes the subjective and the objective operations of the Supper. Its position, then, is central and dominant.[78]

Bucer's English period reflects continuing belief in the operation of the Spirit. In reply to Peter Martyr's requests for criticism of his arguments in the Oxford disputation, Bucer had little to say. He wished only to underscore his colleague's argument for the efficacious presence of the Spirit in the Supper, by which Christ was truly received.[79]

The"Sententious Sayings" reflect this concern:

> .../the Holy Ghost/ furthermore assureth us that we have him with us, that he dwelleth in our hartes, and that we receyve him in the holy supper.[80]

Again, stating his understanding of the manner of the relationship between the elements of the body, Bucer summarizes:

> If I be demaunded, what maner of joynyng may be betwyxt the glorified body of Christ and ther

---

[77] Van De Poll, Ideas, p. 83. [78] Ibid.

[79] Eells, Bucer, p. 403.

[80] Strype, Memorials, II, pp. 855-869, saying 11.

> determinately placed, and the corruptible bread here in earth, contened in a sensyble place; I answer, even such as is betwyxt the regeneration and the dipping in the water, and as is betwyxt the Holy Ghost, and the breath of Christes mouth, which I do call the joyning in the covenant.

For those who receive the elements with a "lively" faith, thus receiving "these signes bodely", obtain spiritually assurance and comfort by partaking of the body and blood.[81]

Thus the relation affirmed between the elements and the body is effected by the Holy Spirit, which is also the source of our faith in Christ, and thus--subjectively and objectively--the means of participation in the true body and blood. The similarity with the teaching of Calvin will not, it is hoped, go unnoticed.[82]

Justification for this extended treatment of Bucer can be found in the arguments presented by many historians for the influence of Bucer in England. Grimm[83] and Van De Poll[84] serve as representatives of this viewpoint. The latter states that Bucer's influence on the Church of England has been great. The

---

[81] *Ibid.*, saying 47.

[82] It is not proposed to enter into the discussion of the extent of Bucer's influence on Calvin, dating from the two visits of Calvin to Strassburg. From the viewpoint of our present topic, it is sufficient to note the similarity of their views, and the chronological precedence of Bucer to Calvin.

[83] Grimm, *Reformation*, p. 305.

[84] Van De Poll, *Ideas*, p. 168.

Censura, his post as professor in Cambridge, and his disputations placed him in the center of theological controversy at a crucial time in the development of the English Church. His influence is seen in terms of his Eucharistic doctrine and his understanding of justification.[85] Whether or not such statements regarding the English Reformation are justified will be discussed below.[86]

Bucer's concern about the fissiparous tendencies of the Protestant body brought him into the middle of one Eucharistic debate after another, not only on the Continent, but also during his short working life in England. Hopf's summary seems justified: "He always thought that both [parties] were more or less desiring the same end".[87] Thus he labored to bring both to a realization of this fact. We must stand with Van De Poll on the question of whether these attempts result in a loss of a definite stand in the dispute. Bucer's proximity to the position of Calvin should avert such a judgment. He belongs to a definite third party, as do Calvin, Bullinger, and--as we hope to show--Peter Martyr. Van Der Poll rightly objects to Köhler's characterization of Bucer's doctrine as a "chaotic tissue of contrasted ideas", and his methods as "eine Taktik und Kunst des Jonglierens und der Wendigkeit." On the contrary, we have in Bucer another distinct factor of the Reformation, not merely a ball bouncing between two walls.[88]

---

[85] *Ibid*. [illegible].

[86] Cf. Van De Poll's objection to Dix's opinion on the question of Bucer's influence, *Ideas*, p. 169.

[87] Hopf, *Bucer*, p. 43.

This is perhaps the point at which we may make some reference to Canon Smyth's summary of Bucer's teachings. Smyth makes bold to state that "Cranmer after his initial conversion from the Roman doctrine...never abandoned the Suvermerian theory of the Eucharist."[89] Smyth makes it plain that the "Suvermerian" view is that of Bucer. Hopf[90] and Watson[91] make it clear that Smyth has committed a blunder of some magnitude. It is not proposed to reproduce here the convincing arguments of Hopf.[92] Briefly, it is clear that Smyth derived the term "Suvermerian" from the latin *suermeri*, the german *Schwärmer* or *Schwärmgeister*. These latter will be recognized as terms employed by Luther against Anabaptists and other radical groups which he more often than not confused with Anabaptists. In Luther~~'s~~ usage, the terms apply to a Eucharistic theology distinctly unlike that of Bucer. As the term *Schwärmgeister* is employed in the early and middle Reformation period of the sixteenth century, Bucer can hardly qualify as a "Suvermerian". Hopf and Watson--the latter's review has a keen edge--remind Smyth that while his desire to credit Bucer with an independent position is laudable, the term he elected to designate that position has been shunned previously for good reason. Smyth's judgment of Bucer is, then, unsatisfactory, though it is agreed that we have here a third element of the protestant party.

---

[88] Van De Poll, *Ideas*, p. 81. This is acceptable, though it is also obvious that between 1528 and 1534 Bucer was very much concerned with finding a solution that both parties could accept. Nevertheless, Eells makes the activity of the early period characteristic of Bucer's entire work. This does not seem at all just.

[89] Smyth, *Cranmer*, p. 25.

[90] Hopf, *Bucer*, pp. 35-40.

[91] E. W. Watson, Review of *Cranmer and the English Reformation under Edward VI*, by C. H. Smyth, *Journal of Theological Studies*, Vol. 28 (1927), p. 204.

[92] Cf. Rupp, Review of *Bucer*, Hopf, pp. 114-119.

In Bucer, finally, we find a similarity with Calvin which is truly striking.[93] On the other hand, it is clear that Bucer was neither a Roman Catholic, a Lutheran, or a Zwinglian.[94] The emphasis on the real presence by faith, by the action of the Holy Spirit--itself effecting both objective and subjective presence--is distinctly Bucerian, though in close proximity to Calvin. Even from thosedifficult times when he vacillated early in the Eucharistic debate on the Continent, we may draw points of Bucer's doctrine which continue as part of his teaching in the more peaceful and systematic statements of the later years--especially the years of his contact with the English Reformers.[95]

An important event of Bucer's life, from our point of view--more important than the possibility that Bucer became a "Zwinglian" in the latter months of his life[96]--was his exchange of opinions and correspondence with Peter Martyr. The importance lies in the question of the relationship of Bucer's and Martyr's views on the question of the real presence, for Martyr was active in the dispute and apparently held in high esteem by Cranmer. Bucer and Martyr are linked together by tradition, and with good reason. We turn, thus, to the teaching of Peter Martyr Vermigli on the question of the real presence.

---

[93] Cf. Harvey, "Bucer", p. 101, for a strongly-worded statement of this similarity.

[94] For an opposing view with which agreement is not possible here, see E. S. Freeman, The Lord's Supper in Protestantism (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1945), p. 99.

[95] Cf. Hopf, Bucer, pp. 42-43.

An exchange of words between Peter Martyr and William Tresham regarding the disputation on the Eucharist at Oxford is reported to have occurred on 28 May, 1549:

> Tresham: He's a very obscure author, and nobody but you has a copy of him.
> Martyr: The book has been printed at Rome, and is on sale.
> Tresham: It would be far too much trouble to go to Rome just to get a book like that.[97]

The book in question was the source of two passages from Theodoret's Dialogues (the Eranistes), which disconcerted the champions of transubstantiation in the dispute. Martyr's opposition to transubstantiation was apparent in the disputation, as it was in his Discourse on the Lord's Supper. Here he remarks:

---

[96] Cf. Dugmore, Mass, pp. 148-149; Hutchinson, Cranmer, pp. 122-123--where it is said that Martyr's belief was in the "bare signs"--and Clark, Sacrifice, p.123.

[97] S. L. Greenslade, The English Reformers and the Fathers of the Church, Inaugural Lecture, Oxford, 10 May, 1960 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960), p. 3.

> the olde fathers had the Sacramentes that we haue, and yet among thē there neded not any suche *transubstanciacion*, that either the stone, or the water that flowed oute of the stone or y^{e} *Manna* should suffre any *transubstanciacion*, whiche thyng at that could not bee dooen. Wherefore such *transubstanciacion* is not requisite to oure Sacramentes neither.[98]

McLelland suggests that Martyr's opposition to the doctrine of transubstantiation is the result of his interest in Aristotle, and his examination of the original philosophy of that august person. Aristotle taught, argued Martyr, that there was indeed a distinction between "accidents separable and inseparable from their substance or subject: *accidentia separabilia et inseparabilia*."[99] Substances such as God and angels have no weight or quality, in which case substance and accident are separable. Once this category is left, however, substance is not separable from accident. Thus Aristotle taught that "the human body...as corporeal substance, cannot exist without locus."[100] As can be seen in the discussion of Aquinas' use of the argument of relationship between substance and accident, this concept of the relationship between accident and substance altered in the case of the Supper.[101] Thus Martyr argues:

> Moreover, by this unnecessary transubstantiation, they pervert the nature of things, since they pluck any accidents from their substance and proper

---

[98] Dugmore, *Mass*, p. 145.

[99] McLelland, *Words*, p. 182.

[100] *Ibid*.

[101] Cf. Appended Note A.

> subject, which is far more than to separate substance from quantity...since an accident is a latter thing than substance.[102]

Transubstantiation was thus not only unscriptural, it was in Martyr's eyes a perversion of the Aristotelean principles on which it was supposedly based.

Transubstantiation was therefore untenable. But so was the Lutheran concept of the corporal presence. Like Calvin, Bucer, and Bullinger, Martyr could not accept an *inclusio localis*:

> ...in [Luther's] opinion I allowe not that grosse knitting together of the bodie of Christ with bread, so as it should be naturallie, corporallie, and reallie comprehended therin. For the holy Scripture...[allows] us not thus to affirme.[103]

In his *Praefatio*, Martyr does affirm a presence, but not the corporal presence:

> Wherefore if *by Presence*, anie understand the handfasting [sic] of our faith, whereby wee our selves ascend into heaven, and both the minde and the spirite imbrace Christ in his maiestie and glorie, to him I will easilie assent. But I utterlie renounce their opinion which contend that the bodie is included and covered in the bread and wine, and affirme it to bee under the shewes of these things, and that they should therein worship and honour him, and brieflie to have it erected for an Idol. This is the head and fountain of all the variance; herein chieflye standeth the state of all the present controversie.[104]

---

[102] McLelland, *Words*, p. 183, from *Disputatio Oxoniensis* IV, conf. 1.4.

[103] *The Common Places of...Peter Martyr*, translated and gathered by Anthonie Marten (London: no publisher, 1583), p. 196; and cf. Clark, *Sacrifice*, p. 120, where the doctrine of a "proper sacrifice in the Eucharist" is described by Martyr as a "figment".

[104] *Common Places*, p. 145.

The similarity of Calvin's teaching of the ascent of the soul to Christ--thus our participation in him--to Martyr's ascent to heaven and Christ by faith is noteworthy.

Ample sources for the rejection of transubstantiation and the corporal presence--the _inclusio localis_ pertinent to the elements--can be found, as in other Reformer's ideas, in Martyr's emphasis on the human nature of Christ. The human nature cannot exist in ubiquitous fashion. It is proper to the divine nature alone to be everywhere, to fill all things. On the other hand, it is a characteristic of human nature to be restricted by time and space, and to be unable to be present in more than one place at the same time.[105] The human nature of Christ will not allow the presence of his body in many elements. The Lutherans have erred here, for they join the humanity of Christ to his divinity:

> yet it follows not therefore that what pertains to the one should be given to the other.... Indeed we grant that the divinity of Christ is everywhere, but we shall not attribute the same thing to his body and his humanity.[106]

McLelland argues--cogently--that Martyr's conception of the ascension mode of Christ's body demands his rejection of the presence of the corporal Christ in the elements. He must conceive of the risen body of Christ as "above the elements". There is a post-resurrection hypostasis of the divine and the human natures; but it is not the same relationship as that which exists between the elements and the body. Were that true, Martyr argues, there would occur yet another hypostasis, one between the body and the elements. This is absurd, for it makes the sacramental presence a wholly separate and distinct hypostasis of Christ:

---

[105] _Ibid_.

[106] McLelland, _Words_, p. 204.

> But if...you would appoint as great a union between bread and the body of Christ as there is between the divine nature and the human in Christ, that would by no means be conceded: because there would be made of bread and the body of Christ one hypostasis, that is, one subject...so that they could never be severed from each other, which is most absurd.[107]

Martyr suggests another explanation for the nature of the Supper, and the presence of Christ. The Supper is, among other things, a memorial of the death and resurrection of Christ.

> ...in receiving the Sacrament of the Eucharist, wee are put in mind of the Lordes death, and of the whole mystrie of our redemption, by reason of the word of God became flesh, thereby is renued the memorie of Gods testament.[108]

Furthermore, in recalling the death of Christ and his work for us, we are bound together as members of his body in the communion of Christ. While we are partakers in the mysteries of the Lord's table, we should meditate on the fact that we are all of one body under one head, Christ. Thus we are "one bread", that is, joined to one another.[109] The memorial aspect of the Supper is, for Martyr, linked to the sense of participation in the body of Christ which is the church, as well as his own body. Thus the words of Consecration must apply more to us than to the bread, for it is the recipients of the elements who are joined together:

---

[107] Ibid., pp. 204-205.

[108] Common Places, pp. 142-143.

[109] Ibid.

> Yes, we ourselves are more joined to Christ than is bread. For Christ is joined in the way He is to bread to this end, that we should truly be united to Him. And the words by which bread is called the body of Christ belong more unto us than unto that, which by nature understands and believes nothing.[110]

We shall see that the presence of Christ in the Supper is partly dependent upon the recipient's faith in Christ. Thus the focus of the reception of and participation in Christ in the Supper is not the bread, but rather the recipient--though there is an objective element in the action of the Holy Spirit, as we shall note.

One implication of this understanding of the words of institution is Martyr's understanding of their specific function. He argues for a symbolical, "tropical" signification of the words--they are not to be comprehended literally. A figurative speech in the Supper is demanded by scripture, by the nature of a Sacrament, and by the tradition of the fathers.[111] The thing signified and the sign must, as in Calvin's thought, both be present and real. Thus he explains the role of the metaphor:

---

[110] McLelland, Words, p. 193, from Disputatio Oxoniensis, III, vs. Tresham.

[111] Ibid., pp. 187-188, and see his illustrations of this matter.

> The metaphor is this, that just as bread naturally nourishes and sustains us, so the flesh of Christ being eaten spiritually and by faith, sustains us in respect of both soul and body.... .... That sacramental bread was the flesh of Christ, to be given unto death for our salvation.... He expresses a metaphorical name for his flesh, because He should be to us for bread, or like bread, of whose property He would admonish us, to understand that the flesh of Christ is bread allegorically.[112]

On the other hand, Martyr insists that the thing signified ought to be really present as well as the sign. He will go so far as to argue for a "sacramental changing" of the elements:

> ...it liketh me not, that they seldome make mention of a sacramentall chaunging of the bread and wine, which nevertheless is no light matter.... Wherefore there is no cause why they should say that this change is of light importaunce seeing it is of great moment. But if they pretend that they doe this, because we should not cleave over much to the signes: we answere, that a remedie may easily be had for this evill through the doctrine whereby men are taught, that Christ, while we communicate, is ioyned unto us with an excellent coniunction, as he dwelleth in us and we in him: who also in the next degree is ioyned with wordes and that by signification: thirdly also he is coupled by signs and also by signification: which coniunction notwithstanding is lesse than that which belongeth unto wordes. Yea and of the former, to wit, the coniunction by the wordes, the signes doe take their sacramentall signification.[113]

Martyr thus agrees that the signs are really present; but he objects strenuously to the argument that signs alone are present. That which is signified is also present. All, he believes, ought to take heed of the reality of both elements, the sign and the thing signified. There is, furthermore, participation in Christ in connection with the reception of the elements. One cannot, therefore, allow a belief in _signa nuda_ which does not take into account the presence of the thing signified.

---

[112] Ibid., p. 172, from Disputatio Oxoniensis IV, vs. Chedsey.

[113] Common Places, p. 196.

Martyr is not reluctant to state his belief in the real presence of Christ in the Supper. Thus he notes the arguments of his adversaries:

> but speciallie they obiected, This is my bodie; about the trueth of which saying standeth the Controversie: Howbeit onely as touching the manner: for both as well they as we affirme the proposition to be true, and contend onely about the sense.[114]

His belief in the necessity of the real presence brought Martyr up ~~against~~ not only the radical Protestants, but against the Romans as well. In drawing up the propositions for the debate with Smyth--which became in the end a debate with Tresham, Morgan, and Chedsey--Martyr argued:

> To deny a carnal presence, then, is not--as the Papists say--to conclude, "it follows of necessity, that there is nothing left in the sacrament but a signification."... The truth is that Christ is present "by a sacramental conjunction, which is a most effectual signification."[115]

Martyr could admit neither the arguments of those who upheld the _inclusio localis_, nor those at the opposite end of the spectrum; but the real presence was a cornerstone of his teaching. He states in the *Praefatio*:

---

[114] _Ibid_., pp. 165-166.

[115] McLelland, _Words_, p. 20.

> I affirme that this [the body and blood of Christ] is truly given and offered unto us as well by wordes as by signes, while they be mightily and most effectually signified by the same. And again in communicating, wee truly receive the selfe same things, when with a full and perfect consent of faith we imbrace those things which be delivered by the signification of the wordes and signes. Whereupon...wee are most neerly ioyned together with Christ.[116]

Again, from the *Praefatio*, we note a strong statement for a real presence of Christ in the Supper:

> When I deny the body of Christ to be present *localiter*, *substantialiter*, *corporaliter et carnaliter*, it must not be inferred that we eat the body of Christ *ficte*, *simulate seu phantastice*. For if by these words they understand the truth of the thing, I will not deny the body of Christ to be truly received by us. For what we comprehend by faith must not be held false or feigned, counterfeit or a phantom.[117]

The body and blood of Christ are really given in the Supper,

> by both words and symbols, while they are potently and most effectively signified through these. And again, in communicating, we truly receive the same when with full and solid assent of faith we grasp those things which are offered by the signification of words and signs.[118]

Martyr will thus affirm the reception of the true body and blood of Christ. His adversaries speak of the benefit of our dwelling in Christ, and Christ in us, of obtaining a divine life, and heavenly blessedness:

---

[116] *Common Places*, p. 147, and cf. McLelland, *Words*, p. 168.

[117] McLelland, *Words*, p. 285. [118] *Ibid*.

> Even that doe I also testifie. Will they boast of a receaving of the body and bloud of Christ? That doe I also proove no lesse than they, but yet such a receaving as is by faith, and from the heart.[119]

It will be sufficiently clear that Martyr consistently sustains an argument for the real presence of Christ, a presence which is not, however, a limitation of the body to the elements. We come, then, to a similar situation to that of Calvin and Bucer. What, given these conditions, is the manner of the presence, and how is such a presence accomplished? We find that Martyr affirms a subjective presence, through faith, and objective presence, through the Holy Spirit, and incidentally a binding of the subjective and objective aspects of the real presence together in the work of the Holy Spirit.

Martyr wishes to link the concept of the real presence to the faith of the recipient. Strype indicates that this element was important to Martyr. Citing a letter to Bucer (15 June, 1549), Strype indicates that Martyr feared that his understanding of the matter might not "square" with Bucer's. But in his own justification he maintained that the body of Christ was present to us by faith, and we are incorporated into him in communication. We do, said Martyr, partake of the matter of the Supper, that is, Christ's body and blood; but by "mind and faith". He also granted that the Holy Spirit was effective in the Sacraments, "by virtue of the Lord's institution."[120]

---

[119] Common Places, p. 143.

The disputation at Oxford yields evidence of the controlling factor of faith in the matter of the presence. Martyr presents his argument that with regard to the words "take ye and eat ye", we must understand that as we eat the bread with our body, so we receive Christ's body by faith, "and with the mind", that we may be strengthened thereby "in place of meat."[121] The body and blood of Christ is taken with bread, but by faith. Nevertheless this does not appear to mean, as Martyr's concern for the presence of Christ in the Supper indicates, anything less than the reception of the thing signified.

From the Praefatio which arose out of the disputation at Oxford, we take the following summary statement:

> This /wholesome diet/ most certainly we have in the holy Supper; where, even as the bread and wine which nourish the body, are given outwardly to the bodie, so is it truly graunted unto their mindes, that by faith they eate the body and bloud of Christ given for our redemption: whereupon the whole man as well inward as outward is restored to the high felicitie. And this is the onlie way that the scripture alloweth and knoweth of eating the bodie, and drinking the bloud of the Lorde, namely, when we apprehend by a constant and firme faith, that Iesus the sonne of God our Lord and saviour gave his body upon the Cross....
>
> Christ gave in the supper, bread and wine for signes, the which by his institution and his words

---

[120] Strype, Memorials, I, pp. 287-288, and cf. McLelland, Words, pp. 273-274.

[121] McLelland, Words, p. 173, from Disputatio Oxoniensis, III vs. Morgan.

> are made sacraments, that is to wit instruments, whereby the holy Ghost stirreth up faith in our minds, that by the same faith we may be spiritually but yet truely nourished and sustained with his bodie and bloud.[122]

This lengthy quotation brings together the following elements of Martyr's understanding of the Eucharist:[123] (1) the unquestioned assertion of the presence of Christ's body and blood in the Supper; (2) the presence of the body and blood to the recipient who has faith; (3) the activity of the Holy Spirit in stirring up this faith. There is yet another function of the Holy Spirit, that of effecting a sacramental objectivism in the Lord's Supper. To this matter we turn.

Martyr presents his concepts of the activity of the Holy Spirit in terms of a mutation or change in the elements. For example, during the Oxford disputation Martyr was called to answer Chedsey's arguments from the fathers regarding the change in the elements which was effected by the words of Consecration. In a long speech Martyr describes his understanding of sacramental change. We note part of it:

> I answer that [Ambrose] meant to prove nothing else than the change of bread which we call a sacramental change, and meant not that the nature of bread should be taken away.... I grant such a change to be of those natures, as they receive other conditions, and ascend to a new degree: for they become sacraments, and they were not so before.[124]

---

[122] Common Places, p. 142.

[123] We separate them only for clarity. Indeed, they cannot be separated when his concept is viewed as an whole.

[124] McLelland, Words, pp. 195-196.

The argument is that the elements no longer remain mere bread and wine. Rather, by some activity of the Holy Spirit, they undergo a mutation. The sacramental mutation appears to mean the change as a result of the objective action of the Holy Spirit in effecting the presence of the body of Christ. Martyr asserts that the power of God effects the addition of a "Sacramental power" to the bread, without altering the substance of the bread--a necessary caveat in view of his position with regard to transubstantiation.

> He is able to make common bread and wine a most effectual sacrament.... Such a change is it, in which bread and wine are translated from the natural order and profane degree in which they were, to a sacramental state and order, both by the work of the Holy Spirit and by the institution of the Lord.[125]

The Holy Spirit, thus, effects the mutation of the nature of the elements from common into sacramental things, signifying the body and blood of Christ, but also bringing about the presence of the things signified:

> For while this holy rite is being performed, there is brought to the signs through the institution and words of the Lord a sacramental reference. And that respect of signifying both the mystical body and the body of Christ Himself is grounded not in the accidents of bread and wine, but even in their natures, through the coming of the Holy Spirit who uses them as instruments.[126]

It is interesting that Martyr links the action of the Holy Spirit with the words of Consecration. Here is a distinctive element in his teaching. The words themselves are the means of mutation, through the power of the Spirit. The Holy Ghost, Martyr explains, sanctifies by means of the instruments of word and Sacrament. Therefore, the mutation or change cannot be denied to the bread and wine by which they are made "effectual" signs of the body and blood of Christ, "myghty in operatiō"; that is to say, by them the Spirit of the Lord works mightily in us. The elements are not common bread and wine, for the Spirit has changed and sanctified them.[127] Martyr thus attributes to the words of Consecration "a distinctive role in the office of the Holy Spirit...and a sacramental mutation qualifying the elements themselves."[128]

---

[125] Ibid.

[126] Ibid.

Summing up Martyr's position, we note that the signs are not "common", but such as may mightily and effectually stir up the mind. But this efficacy is not to be attributed to the elements themselves, but to the action of the Holy Spirit. Opponents who ask how we know the Spirit is at work may be easily answered, for it is already ordained that this is a spiritual eating, which eating requires the work of the Spirit. Further, there is no doubt that the efficacy of the word and of the institution of the Lord are means by which God declares his power. "What else is the Eucharist than the visible Gospel or Word?"

Therefore, argues Martyr, we must not deny the mutation to the elements, for in this they are made powerful signs of the body and blood of Christ by the

---

[127] Dugmore, Mass, p. 147, and cf. McLelland, Words, pp. 282, 283, 284.

[128] McLelland, Words, p. 32.

Spirit of the Lord, which Spirit works within us.[129]

It has been argued by Burnet and Dugmore that Martyr was of the same persuasion on the question of the presence of Christ as "the Helvetian churches",[130] or Zwinglianism "of the Tigurine type".[131] If we take this to mean that Martyr agreed with such a statement of the presence as is found in the _Consensus Tigurinus_--as he appears to have; and thus agreed with Calvin as well as Bullinger, then we may take both suggestions as correct. We cannot, however, call Martyr a "Zwinglian" at all, without danger of anachronism, in view of our conclusions above.

More fruitful ground for comparison may be found in the proximity of Martyr, Bucer, Calvin, and Bullinger. We have noted the arguments of these Reformers on the questions of the real presence, transubstantiation and the corporal presence (i.e. the _inclusio localis_), faith as a controlling factor in reception, the true participation of Christ, and the action of the Holy Spirit in effecting an objective presence of the thing signified as well as the sign. The similarity of the arguments and conclusions are, it seems, clear. Others have noted such similarity.[132]

It has been suggested that Bucer and Martyr had their differences on the matter of the presence. Hopf notes that Bucer "repeatedly" criticizes Martyr, though in friendly tones, on Eucharistic questions. Martyr spoke too vaguely on some matters for Bucer, and at times seemed to contradict the teaching of the real presence.[133] McLelland opposes the idea of making much of the criticisms which Bucer passed on to Martyr in his letter of 1549 regarding the Oxford disputation. As McLelland's arguments seem acceptable, they are presented here. The letter, dated 29 June, suggested propositions of Martyr to which Bucer added his alterations:

---

[129] _Ibid_., pp. 226-227.

[130] Burnet, _Reformation_, II, p. 195.

[131] Dugmore, _Mass_, p. 148.

[132] Cf., e.g., Philip McNair, _Peter Martyr in Italy_ (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967), p. 268; McLelland, _Words_, pp. 277-280; Clark, _Sacrifice_, p. 124.

> 1. In sacramento Eucharistiae non est panis et vini transubstantio in corpus et sanguinem Christi.(Bucer: accepts this simpliciter)
> 2. Corpus et sanguis Christi non est carnaliter aut corporaliter in pane et vino, nec ut alij dicunt, sub speciebus panis et vini. (Bucer replaces by these or similar words: Corpus Christi non continetur localiter in pane et vino: nec iis rebus affixum aut adiunctum est ulla huius mundi ratione).
> 3. Corpus et sanguis Christi uniuntur pani et vino sacramentaliter. (Bucer: add this: ita ut credentibus Christus hic vere exhibetur: fide tamen, nullu vel sensu vel ratione huius seculi intuendus, recipiendus, fruendus).[134]

Clearly none of these suggestions could be considered repugnant to Peter Martyr. Hopf makes too much of the criticism of Bucer. Such differences as may have existed suggest the influence of Bucer's long experience as arbitrator of intra-party fights rather than a disagreement with the elements of Martyr's concept of the presence.[135]

---

[133] Hopf, Bucer, p. 18, and cf. p. 50.

[134] McLelland, Words, p. 274.

[135] Ibid., p. 278, cf. p. 275.

Finally, though this particular problem will concern us later, it is suggested by McLelland that it is Martyr who is the source of Thomas Cranmer's doctrine of the Eucharist. This, as shall be shown, is claming far too much, as Jenkins has noted.[136] On the other hand, Martyr's (and Bucer's) positions in England add weight to the argument for a definite link between the Continental and English Reformations. Dugmore's thesis fails simply because it refuses to take into consideration the importance of these Continental figures, invited to England by Cranmer himself. Though England is the Island Nation, ~~it~~ is not far from the mainland.

---

[136] C. Jenkins, Review of The Visible Words of God, by Joseph C. McLelland, Journal of Theological Studies, N.S. Vol. IX, Part I (April, 1958), p. 188.

III. THOMAS CRANMER ON THE PRESENCE OF CHRIST IN THE SUPPER

The question of the similarity of Cranmer's views on the matter of the presence of Christ in the Eucharist to those of Calvin and his fellows focuses on the role of Peter Martyr and Martin Bucer in England.[1] It has been the usual path to follow the activity of Bucer and Martyr in England, their contacts with Cranmer, and to conclude either that they did influence Cranmer, or that they did not. It is suggested that while such an approach is clearly valid, one ought also to note the proximity of their views on the presence of Christ generally, as has been attempted here. Thus while the conclusions suggested here will be based to some extent on the contacts between Cranmer, Bucer, and Martyr, they will also arise out of a comparison of Cranmer's views and those of Bucer, Martyr, Calvin, and Bullinger, which views have been set forth.

---

[1] For a critical discussion of the development of Cranmer's Eucharistic doctrine until the appearance of the 1549 Prayer Book, see Appended Note C. Special attention is directed towards the interpretation of Cranmer's replies to questioning during the Lords Debate of December 1548 on the matter of the presence of Christ in the Supper found there.

The examination of Cranmer's relationship to the other Reformers discussed here begins with the writings of 1549 for two reasons: (1) the Book of Common Prayer is Cranmer's major liturgical statement of a liturgically-based concept, the presence of Christ in the Supper; (2) Cranmer's understanding of the presence of Christ in the Supper is revealed in its maturity in the years 1549-1552, though the content of that understanding is present in the Lords Debate of December 1548. Thus the Prayer Book of 1549 is elected as the date of the appearance of Cranmer's final teaching on the presence of Christ in the Supper.

Pollard asserts that although Bucer's Censura was requested from Bucer by Cranmer himself, who hoped for incisive criticism of the Book of Common Prayer of 1549, Bucer and the other foreign divines who came to England at Cranmer's invitation "exercised less influence than the Englishmen who had fled from the persecution of Henry VIII, imbibed foreign ideas, and returned under Edward VI."[2] Thus Hooper, Coverdale, and their fellows are given the credit for the overweening influences which created the Anglican Church. Moreover, it is suggested that to label that Church "Lutheran, Zwinglian, or Calvinistic" involves a "distortion of terms".[3]

On the other hand, it has been argued by others that Cranmer was influenced by Bucer. Innes[4] and Styron[5] suggest that Cranmer was drawn to Bucer's concept of the presence. Hutchinson, preferring a more general statement of influence, argues that

---

[2] Pollard, Cranmer, pp. 269-270. [3] Ibid.

[4] Innes, Cranmer, p. 131.

[5] Styron, Three Pelicans, p. 281.

Bucer and Martyr exercised literary rather than personal influence.[6] The same author notes that Cranmer was attracted to Bucer, "particularly for his mediatory offices to effect an understanding between Lutheran and 'reformed' theologians, and even Protestants and Roman Catholics."[7]

Van Der Poll goes so far as to say that Bucer and Cranmer were "in conformity" on the doctrine of the Eucharist.[8]

Before we can attempt a judgment on the matter with which the foregoing opinions are concerned, we ought to examine the Book of Common Prayer of 1549. Here we find a statement of Cranmer's views on the presence which will contribute to a decision on the influence of Bucer, Martyr, and other non-English divines. The question before us is this: do we have in the Book of Common Prayer of 1549 a statement of the presence of Christ in the Supper which differs essentially from such statements as arise out of the Lords Debate?[9] Further, do we find in the _Defence_, the _Answer_, or the Book of Common Prayer of 1552 a deviation from what had gone before? It is suggested here that there is evidence in these works of a consistent teaching of the presence of Christ in the Supper. But such consistency can be admitted only if one re-

---

[6] Hutchinson, _Cranmer_, pp. 118-119.

[7] _Ibid_., p. 121; but see Hutchinson's qualification of these statements in terms of exactly which recommendations were made by Bucer and which ones accepted, p. 124.

[8] Van Der Poll, _Ideas_, p. 168.

[9] See Appended Note C.

recalls the alternative of the Calvin-Bucer-Martyr-Bullinger constellation of the teaching of the presence of Christ. Viewed from this perspective, i.e. the perspective of the denial of the corporal presence--in the manner of the inclusio localis--and the affirmation of an objective spiritual presence and participation controlled by faith, it is suggested that Cranmer can be said to have held a consistent doctrine of the presence from the time of his conversion by Ridley.[10] The criticism of his colleagues, it might be said, deny this possibility. From Cranmer's contemporaries' point of view, this conclusion must be denied. But it is Cranmer's view of the Eucharist which is of interest here, and the relationship of that view to other views--not Cranmer's colleagues' views of his understanding of the presence. We shall examine the works in question in order to determine the extent to which this suggestion may apply.

We may concur in Hutchinson's judgment that the "rhythms and cadences" of the Book of Common Prayer have been a notable English heritage, with an even longer history than the Authorized Version. This debt we owe primarily to Cranmer, for none of his fellows had his depth of knowledge and experience in translating, adapting, and composing liturgical texts.[11]

The period immediately preceding the appearance of the 1549 Prayer Book reflected a more open hostility to the Mass than that of Henry's years. Thus the first act of the reign of Edward was directed against those who spoke in deprecating terms of the mass.[12] A royal decree of 27 December, 1548, further prohibited all discussion about the nature of the presence of Christ in the Mass except by the learned of the universities and of Convocation--and even those discussions were to be private.[13] Jasper Ridley paraphrases the decree thus:

---

[10] See Appended Note C.

[11] Hutchinson, Cranmer, p. 107.

> the people must believe that the body and blood of Christ is there; but no one must discuss, either in the pulpit or in the alehouse, whether it is there really or figuratively, whether with legs, arms, toes and nails, and whether both flesh and blood were in both the bread and wine....[14]

An Order of Communion was drafted in 1548, probably as an experiment for suggested new forms of the Prayer Book. This interim document was composed of an exhortation to the parishioners to prepare for communion--given out by the priest some days before communion was to be held--and an English form for administration of communion that was to be inserted into the latin Mass. Ridley argues that the Order is not definite on the matter of the real presence, and that "it is unlikely that Cranmer intended to make any great innovation with the new communion service."[15] Hughes, on the other hand, sees in the Order a clear denial of the real presence, here meaning the corporal inclusion of Christ in the elements.[16] Indeed, there are phrases that deny the corporal presence of Christ in the elements. Thus Dix points to the explanation of the Eucharist found in the exhortation: it is

---

[12] Powicke, Reformation, pp. 81-82.

[13] Jasper Ridley, Thomas Cranmer (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962), p. 275.

[14] "This was the old policy of Henry's reign of imposing a complete prohibition on both criticism and defence of the established doctrines." Ibid. J. Ridley also declares that Cranmer "must certainly have approved, even if he did not draft it." No evidence is cited in support of this point.

[15] Ibid., p. 279.

> A Most Comfortable Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, to be taken of them in the remembrance of His most fruitful and glorious passion; by the which passion we have obtained remission of our sins, and be made partakers of the kingdom of heaven, whereof we be assured and ascertained if we come to the said Sacrament with repentance, faith, and intention of amendment.[17]

However, the Prayer of Humble Access of the 1548 Order includes the phrase, "so to eat the flesh of thy dear son Jesus Christ and to drink his blood in these holy mysteries, that we may continually dwell in him."[18] The wording indicates a belief in a real participation in Christ, a union with him which is directly linked to the elements. As shall be argued with regard to the Prayer Books and the Answer and Defence, here is an indication that Cranmer denies the corporal inclusion of Christ in the elements, while affirming a real spiritual participation in him in the Supper.

The Order of Communion was a part of the liturgical corpus brought together to form the Book of Common Prayer.[19] The content of the new service book was debated in Parliament, 14-18 December, 1548. The doctrine suggested for the book did not go unchallenged. Pollard suggests that such alterations as were made were carried out in order to gain "a majority of episcopal votes in its favour."[20] A majority of prelates would not have voted for the doctrine laid down by Cranmer, and various alterations were introduced to modify Catholic hostility. Perhaps the most important was the change made in the phrase "Sacrament of bread", and "Sacrament of wine". Bonner objected strenuously to these phrases, pointing out that the doctrine implied was not acceptable, for "it hath been condemned abroad as an heresy; and in this Realm: example of Lambert."[21] Thus the phrases in question were altered to read "Sacrament of the body" and "Sacrament of the blood."[22]

---

[16] Hughes, Reformation, II, p. 108, cf. p. 102.

[17] Dix, Liturgy, p. 643. Hutchinson, Cranmer, notes, "it was at any rate the evident intention of Cranmer, in preparing the new Order, that the aspect of receiving the communion should have precedence over assistance at the mass said by the priest without any communicating by himself." P. 120.

[18] Dix, Liturgy, p.644.

---

[19] For a discussion of the sources of the Book of Common Prayer, cf., e.g., Thompson, _Liturgies_, pp. 227ff.; E. C. Ratcliff, _The Book of Common Prayer in the Church of England: Its Making and Revisions, 1549-1661_ (London: S.P.C.K., 1949); Francis A. Gasquet and Edmund Bishop, _Edward VI and the Book of Common Prayer_ (2nd ed.; London: John Hodges, 1891); F. E. Brightman, _The English Rite_ (2 Vols.; London: Rivingtons, 1915).

[20] Pollard, _Cranmer_, pp. 219-220.

[21] Powicke, _Reformation_, p. 85.

[22] _Ibid_. Cf. J. Ridley, _Cranmer_, p. 289: "This was quite reconcilable with the manner in which Cranmer interpreted his doctrine of the presence."

We turn now to the Book of Common Prayer of 1549 itself. Indications of Cranmer's position on the matter of the presence may be found here. But one must bear in mind that, unlike his statements in the Defence and the Answer, the phrases of the Book of Common Prayer were subject to approval by a rather broad spectrum of opinion. Further, the Book of Common Prayer is intended to be just that--a Book of Common Prayer, fit for use by all. These caveats delivered, let us proceed.

An exhortation to receive communion points to the central role of faith in the reception of the Sacrament:

> For as the benefite is great, if with a truly penitent heart, and liuely faith, we receiue that holy Sacramēt: (for then we spiritually eate the fleshe of Christ, and drinke his bloude, then we dwell in Christ and Christ in us, wee bee made one with Christ, and Christ with us) so is the daunger great, yf wee receyue the same unworthily, for then wee become gyltie of the body and bloud of Christ our sauior, we eate and drinke our owne damnacion, not considering the Lordes bodye.[23]

If faith controls the reception, it is indeed Christ himself which we receive--but there is no question of inclusio localis here. Christ is truly, if not corporally, present and received by faith. Thus the exhortation continues:

> ...he hath lefte in those holy Misteries, as a pledge of his loue, and a continuall remēbraunce of

---

[23] First and Second Prayer Books of Edward VI, ed. E. C. S. Gibson (London: Everyman, 1910), p. 215; also in Thompson, Liturgies, p. 249, where "and" is printed "&".

> the same his owne blessed body, and precious bloud, for us to fede upon spiritually, to our endles comfort and consolation.[24]

Again, in an exhortation for Sunday of a holy day, the people are reminded that God "...doothe vouchsaue in a Sacrament and Mistery, to geue us his sayed bodye and bloud to feede upon spiritually."[25]

The Prayer preceding the administration of the elements gives an indication of Cranmer's belief in the real presence of Christ in the Supper. The priest prays thus:

> O God heauenly father, which of thy tender mercie, diddest geue thine only sonne Jesu Christ, to suffre death upon the crosse for our redempcion, who made there (by his one oblacion once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifyce, oblacion, and satysfaccyon, for the sinnes of the whole worlde, and did institute, and in his holy Gospell commaund us, to celebrate a perpetuall memory, of that his precious death, untyll his comming again: Heare us (O merciful father) we besech thee: and with thy holy spirite and worde, vouchsafe to blesse* and sanctify* these thy gyftes and creatures of bread and wyne, that they maie be unto us the bodye and bloude of thy moste derely beloued sonne Jesus Christ.[26]

Gardiner argued that this passage indicated an invocation of the Holy Spirit to bring the body and blood of Christ into the elements at the words of Consecration, which immediately follow. Modern critics have concurred in this criticism. There is, however, another possible explanation.

---

[24] Gibson, Prayer Books, p. 215; Thompson, Liturgies, p. 250.

[25] Gibson, Prayer Books, p. 216; Thompson, Liturgies, ibid.

[26] Gibson, Prayer Books, p. 222; Thompson, Liturgies, pp. 257-258. * indicates signing with the cross.

One can see in this passage evidence of the connection between Cranmer's obvious concern for the real presence of Christ in the Supper and the work of the Holy Spirit in effecting an objective, though non-corporal, presence of Christ in the Supper. That Cranmer denies the work of the Eucharist as a sacrifice is very clear in the above passage. Yet the language of the above passage does affirm a very real presence, even an objective presence--one effected by the power of the Holy Spirit. Here is language close to that of Calvin's affirmation of the reality of the presence and his concomitant denial of the corporal inclusion of Christ in the elements. The words "be unto us", furthermore, indicate a concern for the true reception of the body and blood of Christ. Such concern is present elsewhere in Cranmer, as we shall note, and in Calvin's use of realist terminology with reference to the reception of Christ. Thus it is this interpretation which is suggested to be more consistent with Cranmer's other statements on the issue than that of an inclusio localis or a corporal eating as was derived from transubstantiation. The prayer, when read in terms of this distinction, is comprehensible. It makes sense if one understands that Cranmer wishes to deny the corporal presence, while affirming an objective spiritual presence.

Further, we have noted that faith is a

controlling factor in the reception of the body and blood of Christ for Calvin. It is present in that capacity in this prayer as well. Immediately following the passage noted above, the priest prays,

> Wherfore, O Lorde and heauenly father, accordyng to the Instytucyon of thy derely beloued sonne..., we thy humble seruauntes do celebrate, and make here before thy divine Maiestie, with these thy giftes, the memoryall whyche thy sonne hath wylled us to make,...renderyng unto thee most hartie thankes, for the innumerable benefites procured unto us by the same...: most humbly beseching thee to graunt, that by the merites and death of thy sōne Jesus Christ, and through faith in his bloud, we and al thy whole church, may obteigne remission of our sinnes, and all other benefites of hys passyon.[27]

We find here a corresponding subjective presence and participation which is very much like that of Calvin's understanding of the Supper. The worthy, or the faithful, receive the body and blood of Christ:

> And here wee offre and present unto thee (O Lorde) ourselfe, oure soules, and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and liuely sacrifice unto thee: humbly besechyng thee, that whosoeuer shalbee partakers of thys holy Communion, maye worthely receiue the moste precious body and bloude of thy sonne Jesus Christe.[28]

The participation in the body of Christ is reaffirmed in the actual reception of the elements. The priest first receives communion, and then prays,

> Graunt us therefore (gracious lorde) so to eate the fleshe of thy dere sonne Jesus Christ, and to drynke his bloud in these holy Misteries, that we may continuallye dwell in hym, and he in us, that oure synfull bodyes may bee made cleane by his body, and our soules washed through hys most precious bloud. Amen.[29]

---

[27] Thompson, Liturgies, p. 258.

[28] Ibid., cf. Gibson, Prayer Books, p. 223.

bloud. Amen.[29]

The elements are then delivered to the people, these words preceding the giving of the elements to each person: "the bodye of our Lorde Jesus Christe whiche was geuen for thee, preserue thy body and soule unto euerlasting lyfe.[30]

A post-communion prayer states what has been received by the faithful:

> Almightye and eyerlyuyng God, we most hartely thanke thee, for that thou hast vouchsafed to feede us in these holy Misteries, with the spirituall foode of the most precious body and bloud of thy sonne, our saviour Jesus Christ, and hast assured us (duely receiuing the same) of thy favour and goodnes toward us, and that we be very membres incorporate in thy Misticall bodye, which is the blessed companye of all faythfull people.[31]

Regardless of the interpretation of the 1549 Prayer Book, it was not well received. The revolt of the shires of Devon and Cornwall was directly linked to the Book of Common Prayer by the revolutionaries themselves. Their "fourth demand" was that the Sacrament should hang over the altar, as it had in the past, where it should be worshipped. Cranmer replied at length to this and other demands:

> ...no man doth duely receive the Sacrament, except he so, after than maner, do worship Christ, whom he

---

[29] Thompson, Liturgies, p. 261, and Gibson, Prayer Books, p. 258.

[30] Ibid.

[31] Thompson, Liturgies, p. 263, and Gibson, Prayer Books, p. 227.

> spiritually receiveth, spiritually feedeth and nourisheth upon, and by whom spiritually he liveth, and continueth that life that is towards God.[32]

Hooper opposed the supposed commemoration of the dead and "some ceremonies" of the ordinal--to the point of refusing to be ordained bishop according to that ordinal in 1550.[33] The correspondents of Bullinger were considerably disturbed at what they saw in the new Prayer Book. Dryander remarked that with regard to the Lord's Supper,

> the book speaks very obscurely, and however you may try to explain it with candour, you cannot avoid great absurdity. The reason is that the bishops could not for a long time agree among themselves respecting this article.[34]

Bucer wrote to Fagius with his complaint that

> some concessions have been made both to a respect for antiquity and to the infirmity of the age /especially with regard to/ the vestments enjoined for the celebration of the Eucharist, the use of candles and the chrism, and the commemoration.[35]

---

[32] Strype, Memorials, II, p. 816.

[33] Van Der Poll, Ideas, p. 145. Van Der Poll, however, refers to Hooper as "Zwinglian".

[34] Original Letters Relative to the English Reformation, ed. for the Parker Society by Hastings Robinson (2 Vols.; Cambridge, England: the University Press, 1847), I, p. 351; 5 June, 1549. This report appears in an otherwise favorable assessment of the Book of Common Prayer.

[35] Pollard, Cranmer, pp. 220-221. Pollard further adduces a letter from Traheron to Bullinger, Original Letters, I, p. 323, 31 December, 1548. He quotes Traheron as saying, "The foolish bishops have made a marvelous recantation." Actually, the phrase occurs

These objections, it will be noted, are directed toward either the implications of various parts of the Prayer Book such as the rubrics concerning furniture, dress, or procedure, or against the obscurity of the passages concerning the doctrine of the presence of Christ. More modern writers have rendered judgment on the Prayer Book of 1549 despite objections by its contemporaries to its obscurity on this major issue. Thus Pollard states that the Book was "neither Roman nor Zwinglian", and is thus mainly described as Lutheran. This is due in large part to the "common conservatism" which led both Anglican and Lutheran service books to retain Catholic elements rejected by Reformed groups.[36] On the basis of former observations, it is suggested that there is no basis for Pollard's contention that the 1549 Prayer Book was not "calvinistic", however.

Hughes argues that of the Reformers "none was a better judge than Calvin of what was obviously popery in a prayer or rite"; and Calvin accepted the Prayer Book of 1549.[37] Bainton ultimately sides with Pollard in saying that the Prayer Book was "basically Lutheran

---

in a postscript to the letter from Traheron to Bullinger added by ab Ulmis, who "happened to come into his room." It is ab Ulmis who writes this, not Traheron. Furthermore, there is no reference to the Book of Common Prayer--indeed, there could be none at this early date--but only to the debate in the House of Lords of December 1548. There is no clear reference to the Book of Common Prayer by either ab Ulmis or Traheron.

[36] Pollard, Cranmer, pp. 220ff.

[37] Hughes, Reformation, II, p. 111.

though at some points closer to the Mass."[38] Thus, with Pollard, Bainton does not give consideration to the possibility of a link between Calvin's concept of the presence and that of the Prayer Book. Yet it is Calvin's doctrine which provides the clearest explanation of the stand taken by Cranmer in the Prayer Book. The "calvinistic" alternative of the denial of the corporal presence and the affirmation of the real presence of Christ in the elements is what is present in the teaching of the Prayer Book of 1549. In the face of this alternative, the judgments of Pollard and Bainton lack strength.[39] That his contemporaries do not appear to have understood the Prayer Book in this fashion does not, it is suggested, debilitate the case. The tradition of interpreting the presence of Christ in terms of corporal inclusion on the one hand, or in terms of heresy on the other was too strong. The proximity to Calvin's view is reasonably clear, at least reasonably possible.

Martin Bucer and Peter Martyr were consulted not long after the promulgation of the Prayer Book. Cranmer appealed to both for criticisms of it. This may well indicate that from the beginning the plan had been to produce a second edition, keeping in mind the faults of the first. It is not absolutely certain that this was the case. It seems a viable suggestion, nevertheless.

---

[38] Bainton, Reformation, pp. 201-202.

[39] Similar criticism may be directed against Innes, Cranmer, p. 125, Grimm, Reformation, p. 304 and Styron, Three Pelicans, p. 315.

Bucer produced the Censura to comply with the Archbishop's request. It is a wide-ranging document; but our concern is with the question of the presence of Christ in the Supper. We shall therefore limit our examination of the Censura to pertinent comments. Bucer disapproved strongly, for example, of the rubric which called for the preparation of only so much wine and bread as was sufficient for those present.[40] Bucer argued that such instructions would give rise to the idea that the elements were sacred "qua talis". Some might think that Christ was enclosed in the elements, and thus think that they should worship the bread and wine. Bucer understood the situation thus: "Christum Dominum non pani et vino, sed piis mentibus offeri per verba Domini et haec symbola."[41] For the same reasons, Bucer is pleased that a loaf and not a wafer is used in communion. Otherwise, the people would be tempted to think that Christ was corporally present in "particular panis", and thus "quali localiter inclusum est".[42]

Suggestion of the corporal presence was seen by Bucer in the post-communion rubric which appears thus:

> and euery one [of the pieces of bread] shall be deuided in two pieces, at the least, or more, by

---

[40] See Thompson, Liturgies, p. 254.

[41] Van Der Poll, Ideas, p. 150.

[42] Ibid., pp. 149-150, and cf. Hopf, Bucer, p. 76.

> the discrecion of the minister, and so distributed. And menne muste not thynke lesse to be receyued in parte, then in the whole, but in eache of them the whole body of our sauiour Jesu Christ.[43]

He suggested that these words be omitted for this reason.[44] Bucer also disapproves of the making of the cross over the bread and wine. He fears that the words "benedictio, consecratio, santificatio", when used in conjunction with the elements, might imply the "mutatio (transubstantiatio)" of the elements. It is better, he says, to prescribe "fractio panis".[45]

Bucer is clearly sensitive to possible interpretations of the Supper as a sacrifice, and to the slightest hint of Consecration. This objection he raises against the invocation of the Holy Spirit:

> and with thy holy spirite & worde, vouchsafe to blesse and sanctifie these thy gyftes and creatures of bread and wyne, that they may be unto us the bodye and bloude of thy most derely beloued sonne Jesus Christe.[46]

It is Bucer's opinion that such phraseology might be explained in terms of transubstantiation. He corresponded with Peter Martyr on this matter. From these letters it is apparent that Bucer believes that "the words of the Lord's Supper have more bearing upon the partakers than upon the bread and wine."[47]

---

[43] Thompson, Liturgies, p. 266

[44] Hopf, Bucer, pp. 75-76: "This rubric was used by Stephen Gardiner for affirming that the Prayer Book was 'well termed not distant from the catholic faith in my judgment.'"

[45] Van Der Poll, Ideas, p. 153. This was omitted in the 1552 edition.

[46] Thompson, Liturgies, pp. 257-258.

The Prayer of Humble Access contained the words "so to eate the flesh of thy dere sonne Jesus Christ, and to drynke his bloud in these holy Misteries, that we may continuallye dwell in hym, and he in us...."[48] Bucer felt that, far from expressing the real presence too strongly, this phrase expressed it too weakly.[49] The words in question did not appear in the 1552 Prayer Book.[50]

Eells rightly understands that the extent to which Bucer's Censura was influential in determining in determining the form of the 1552 Prayer Book can never be defined with certainty, for lack of external evidence on the matter.[51] Not all of his recommendations were accepted.[52] That Bucer is an influential presence in England is admitted. Cranmer and he had been in correspondence since 1536. Bucer was instrumental in drawing up a service book, the Simplex et pia deliberatio, for Archbishop Hermann von Wied and the Reformed party in Cologne.[53] This work was used by Cranmer in the preparation of the Prayer Book. He was invited to England by Cranmer himself, and well cared for until his death. These points indicate that Cranmer and Bucer were well acquainted, and that they held each other in mutual esteem. The Censura indicates this as well. Perhaps final judgment ought to be postponed until treatment of Cranmer's longer statements on the Eucharist is completed.[54]

---

[47] Van Der Poll, Ideas, p. 153. On the other hand, he would not argue that they had no bearing whatsoever on the elements. "Yet Bucer's criticism is wrong. It is true that Gardiner thought that the epiclesis in this version 'implied transubstantiation', but Cranmer wrote to him, 'We do not ask for alteration, but that these elements may be body and blood for us ', that is, that we may thus eat and drink them." Ibid. Van Der Poll appears to comprehend the matter as Cranmer did. Cf. Hopf, Bucer, pp. 77-78.

[48] Thompson, Liturgies, p. 261.

[49] Van Der Poll, Ideas, pp. 154-155. Van Der Poll concludes that Bucer's position was closer to Calvin than to any other Reformer. With this we agree. Bucer "stresses a real and true presence of Christ, not in or under the bread and wine, but in the Supper proper." Cranmer would not quarrel with this concept. Van Der Poll argues further that Bucer based his Eucharistic doctrine firmly on the belief of "Christi praesentiam et exhibitionem". The Prayer Book does not, according to Van Der Poll, contain this element. This "may be due to the circumstance that Cranmer held the essence of the Supper to be the Sursum Corda'...." Ibid. This suggestion appears to give deserved weight to both Cranmer and Bucer. But the elements of the Sursum Corda and the "Christi praesentiam et exhibitionem" are not necessarily exclusive here.

[50] Why this occurred is the subject of a brief and rather confused discussion in Hopf, Bucer, pp. 79-81.

Strype notes that Martyr was also consulted on the question of the teaching of the new service book. Unfortunately the document containing his judgments has been lost. The only reference to it is a letter from Martyr to Bucer, in which Martyr writes that he agreed with Bucer's amendments, and thanks God for the occasion to "admonish" the bishops of these things.[55] McLelland argues for the theological unity of Bucer and Martyr at this time. He also states that the practice of reserving of consecrated elements to be given the sick in private communion was revised on Martyr's advice "alone".[56] This statement is hardly susceptible of proof, though the alteration was indeed made.

---

[51] Eells, Bucer, p. 412. He surmises, however, that in the end it cannot be claimed that his influence was of great importance, though it did help to rid the liturgy of many elements perpetuating "Roman superstitions". Eells does not claim expertise in the field of "Roman superstitions".

[52] The statement of the real presence in the Prayer of Humble Access is altered considerably, cf. Thompson, Liturgies, p. 280.

[53] Clark, Sacrifice, p. 122.

[54] Harvey, "Bucer", argues that Bucer and Cranmer are very similar indeed, though his treatment centers on common "Zwinglische elementen.", pp. 56-57.

---

[55] Strype, Memorials, I, p. 301.

[56] McLelland, Words, pp. 29ff. This leads us to a consideration of McLellands's argument for the influence of Martyr on Cranmer and thus on the Church of England. He states that with regard to the Oxford Disputation of 1549, "Peter Martyr's doctrine, as defended in the Disputation and set forth in the same year in print along with the Treatise, and as endorsed by Cox and Cranmer, was now the recognized doctrine of the Church, and therefore normative for the drawing up of the Second Edwardian Prayer Book of 1552 and the Forty-Two Articles of 1553." Ibid., p. 23. McLelland argues in a footnote that (1) Cranmer's Defence and Martyr's Disputation and other writings look very much alike; (2) Cox, who proctored the Disputation at Oxford, and Cranmer were close friends of Martyr; (3) Cranmer declared that he and Martyr would defend the Prayer Book at the beginning of Mary's reign; (4) the king declared that he was greatly interested in Martyr's doctrine. The MS of the 1549 edition of the Disputation has a summarizing statement in the king's handwriting. To say on the basis of the above arguments that Martyr's doctrine is normative for the English Church is clearly to claim too much. Yet this seems to be McLelland's purpose. We share Jenkins' opinion: "To the historical student his ardour may seem to make him inclined to prove too much, especially as to Martyr's influence, undoubtedly great, with Archbishop Cranmer in comparison with that of other...Reformers...." Jenkins, Review of Words, p. 188

McLelland's more moderate claims for Martyr, especially in his relationship to Bucer's teachings, seem acceptable: "Without compromising his [Martyr's] doctrine by a simple identification with that of Bucer, we may state that the theology of these two men exerted a more personal and profound influence upon Cranmer than any other from 1549 on."[57] However, this judgment might be further revised to include the confessed influence of Ridley on Cranmer's belief in the presence of Christ.[58]

McLelland reveals his concern for the importance of Martyr to the English Church to a startling degree in the following comment:

> We submit therefore, that Peter Martyr's doctrine, ...is the doctrine which Cranmer accepted as at least standing in agreement with the Prayer Book and the articles of Edward's reign; which John Jewel and his friends considered their own theological position during Elizabeth's time; and which, although not receiving definite expression by any group in the subsequent history of the Church of England--since Puritanism, for example, cannot be called validly the true inheritor of this theology of Martyr and Calvin--yet was one whose influence is evident throughout the history of the Church in England, for example in the debates of Cheke, Whitgift, and Cartwright, or Gorham.

He concludes with an appeal for more attention to

---

[57] McLelland, Words, pp. 38ff.

[58] We have already noted Ridley's doctrine of the real presence; with its objective element of the action of the Holy Spirit and the subjective controlling factor of faith, the strong similarity to that of Martyr, Bucer, Calvin, and Bullinger is evident. Cf. also Appended Note C.

Martyr's thought in the present search for "ecumenical truth".[59] This is really going too far.

Bucer and Martyr were asked to contribute constructive criticism of the new service book. They were not alone in finding faults in its content. Stephen Gardiner pointed out the weakness of the Book as a Reformed document by noting contradictory implications which he understood to arise out of its statements. He was prepared to "jibe bitterly at the inconsistency between its implied theology and the archbishop's teaching on the Lord's Supper."[60] So far as the Prayer Book itself was concerned, he pointed out that on several points the teaching of the Book and that of orthodox Catholicism were identical. His Explication and Assertion was written in reply to Cranmer's Defence.[61] Gardiner found in the communion service references not only to the corporal inclusion of Christ in the elements, but also to transubstantiation. He asserted that therefore the theory of transubstantiation was upheld many years after the papacy had been repudiated; for it had been "confession for a truth by all the clergy of this realm in an open council", and had never been "by any public council, or anything set forth by authority, impaired."[62]

---

[59] McLelland, Words, pp. 38ff.

[60] Powicke, Reformation, p. 86.

[61] The latter appeared in 1550, the former in 1551. We shall deal with Gardiner's arguments first, though they follow chronologically Cranmer's first major treatise. We shall then proceed to deal with the Defence and the Answer together, since they comprise the most systematic statement which Cranmer produced on the question at hand.

Gardiner held that five passages in the communion service explicitly upheld Catholic doctrine. These were the following: (1) the words of distribution and the use of the terms "body" and "blood"; (2) the rubric for the division of the bread into at least two pieces, and the explanation that the whole Christ was received in each part; (3) the _epiclesis_ in the prayer of consecration, i.e. "with thy holy Spirit... bless...that they may be...the body, etc."; (4) the prayer for the Church and for the dead, which implied a "mass propitiatory"; (5) the Prayer of Humble Access, before the communion. Gardiner stated that "The adoration of Christ's flesh in the Sacrament...is, in my judgment, well set forth."[63]

We come at last to the major statements of Cranmer himself, the _Defence_ and the _Answer_. These are taken together in view of the fact that Cranmer reiterates his arguments of the _Defence_ in the _Answer_, though with more venom. It is suggested that far from there being inconsistency between the Prayer Book of 1549 and the statements of the _Defence_ and _Answer_, it is very possible that they are very much the work of the same man, and exhibit the same concept of the pre-

---

[62] Muller, _Gardiner_, p. 210.

[63] _Ibid_., pp. 215-216. Muller, _ibid_., and Dugmore, _Mass_, pp. 154-155, agree that, in the latter's words, "This attitude of the Henricians towards the first Edwardine Prayer Book was, indeed, one of the main reasons why further revision of it was undertaken." It is noteworthy that the basis for revision was the opinion of two opposing groups, not that the doctrine had to be changed in and for itself. Policy dictated revision, not theology.

presence. That concept is, further, essentially that of Calvin, Bucer, Martyr, and Bullinger when one views the works in question in terms of the categories of a denial of the corporal presence and an affirmation of a real presence which does not imply an *inclusio localis*. Gardiner, it is suggested, was therefore very possibly wrong in his criticism. He and his followers, including not a few more modern divines, have erred in denying the possibility that Cranmer did in fact deny the corporal presence, but--far from asserting the presence of bare signs--affirmed an objective presence of Christ, "but spiritually". For them, a spiritual presence is no presence at all. Only a corporal presence is a real presence. It is submitted that Cranmer, along with Calvin, Bucer, Martyr, and Bullinger, would challenge that assertion, and with some vigor.

Cranmer's opposition to the teaching of the transubstantiation of the elements into the substance of the body and blood of Christ is based on his concern for the reality of the elements. Without receiving true signs, there is no need for faith.

> For if we receive no bread nor wine in the holy communion, then all these lessons and comforts be gone, which we should learn and receive by eating of the bread and drinking of the wine. And that phantastical imagination giveth an occasion utterly to subvert our whole faith in Christ. For if this sacrament be ordained in bread and wine, which be foods for the body, to signify and declare unto us our spiritual food by Christ, then if our corporal feeding upon the bread and wine be but phantastical, (so that there is no bread and wine there indeed to feed upon, although they appear there to be) then it doth us to understand, that our spiritual feeding in Christ is also phantastical, and

> that indeed we feed not of him.[64]

Christ is not corporally enclosed in the elements, for he is in heaven:

> For figuratively he is in the bread and wine, and spiritually he is in them that worthily eat and drink the bread and wine; but really, carnally, and corporally he is only in heaven, from which he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.[65]

A corporal inclusion of Christ in the elements thus destroys the true reception of Christ:

> For our regeneration in Christ is spiritual, and our eating and drinking is a spiritual feeding, which kind of regeneration and feeding requireth no real and corporal presence of Christ, but only his presence in spirit, grace and effectual operation.[66]

It is the bread that is eaten "corporally" in the Supper, "which is a sacrament and figure of Christ's body; but spiritually we eat also his very body, and drink his very blood."[67]

The human nature of Christ is seriously impaired by the doctrine of the inclusio localis. The logical problems arising out of a belief in the inclusion of the body of Christ in the elements brings Cranmer to a strong expression of scorn:

> But by these papists' doctrine, there is no such distinction of members in the sacrament; for either there is no head, feet, hands, arms, legs, mouth, eyes, and nose at all; or else all is head, all feet, all hands, all arms, all legs, all mouth,

---

[64] The Work of Thomas Cranmer, ed. G.E. Duffield, with an introduction by J. I. Packer (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1965), p. 74.

[65] Ibid., p. 169.

[66] Ibid., p. 172.

[67] Ibid., p. 187. commenting on Theophylact.

> all eyes, and all nose. And so they make of Christ's body no body at all.[68]

It is clear to Cranmer that the words of Christ in the institution of the Supper deny the corporal inclusion in the elements, and the eating of the same:

> Of these words of Christ it is plain and manifest, that the eating of Christ's flesh, and drinking of his blood is not like to the eating and drinking of other meats and drinks. For although without meat and drink man cannot live, yet it followeth not, that he that eateth and drinketh shall live for ever.[69]

The sense of the objective presence in Cranmer does not extend to consumption of the physical body--though we shall see some very strong language from him on this matter in another context. Such a teaching is contrary to accepted christology:

> This is the dignity and excellency of Christ's flesh and blood joined to his divinity; of the which dignity Christ's adversaries, the papists, deprive and rob him, which they affirm that such men do eat his flesh and receive this plaster, as remain still sick and sore, and be not holpen thereby.[70]

It appears that Gardiner did not fully understand Cranmer's denial of the corporal presence, despite the Archbishop's vigorous attempts to make this clear. In the Answer, he further clarifies his position:

> Moreover, when I say and repeat many times in my book /Defence/, that the body of Christ is present in them that worthily receive the sacrament; lest any man should mistake my words, and think

---

[68] Ibid., p. 192.

[69] Ibid., p. 61.

[70] Ibid., p. 204.

> that I mean, that although Christ be not corporally in the outward visible signs, yet he is corporally in the persons that duly receive them, this is to advertise the reader, that I mean no such thing; but my meaning is, that the force, the grace, the virtue and benefit of Christ's body that was crucified for us, and of his blood that was shed for us, be really and effectually present with all them that duly receive the sacraments: But all this I understand of his spiritual presence.... No more truly is he corporally or really present in the due ministration of the Lord's Supper, than he is in the due ministration of baptism.[71]

Calvin would understand and agree with this statement. Gardiner appears not only to have disagreed, but to have misunderstood the distinction Cranmer is making regarding a real presence of Christ in the believer--to the point of saying that the "virtue and benefit of Christ's body that was crucified for us" are present in the reception of the Supper. Cranmer replies directly to Gardiner's assertion that the doctrine of the 1549 Prayer Book is in conformity with Catholic teaching:

> And as concerning the form of doctrine used in this church of England in the holy communion, that the body and blood of Christ be under the forms of bread and wine, when you shall shew the place where this form of words is expressed, then shall you purge yourself of that, which in the meantime I take to be a plain untruth.[72]

Eucharistic orthodoxy of the papists is christological heresy:

> And so be you clean overthrown with your transubstantiation, except you will join yourself with

---

[71] _Writings and Disputations of Thomas Cranmer_, ed. for the Parker Society by John Edmund Cox (Cambridge, England: the University Press, 1844), p. 1.

[72] _Ibid_., p. 53.

> those heretics, which denied Christ's humanity and divinity to remain both together.[73]

Thus Cranmer makes quite clear his rejection of the corporal presence of Christ in the Supper.

Just as clearly does he deny the position that the elements are but bare signs or tokens. The Answer is quite explicit:

> For I say not, that in the Lord's supper is but a figure, or that Christ is eaten only figuratively; but I say, "that there is a figure, and figurative eating".... The flesh of Christ is a true flesh, and was born of a woman, died, rose again, ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of his Father; but yet is he eaten of us spiritually, and in the manner of the eating, there is the mystery and secret, and yet the true work of God.[74]

The signs are effective signs. They contain the power of Christ's presence:

> for the effect of his godly eating...is the communication of Christ's body and blood, but to the faithful receiver, and not to the dumb creatures

---

[73] *Ibid.*, p. 284.

[74] *Ibid.*, p. 232. Cranmer apparently felt that he had been misinterpreted in such statements as the following from the *Defence*:

> And the bread and wine be not so changed into the flesh and blood of Christ, that they be made one nature, but they remain still distinct in nature, so that the bread in itself is not his flesh, and the wine his blood, but unto them that worthily eat and drink the bread and wine, to them the bread and wine be his flesh and blood; that is to say, by things natural and which they be accustome unto, they be exalted unto things above nature. For the sacramental bread and wine be not bare and naked figures, but so pithy and effectuous, that whosoever eateth them, eateth spiritually Christ's flesh and blood, and hath by them everlasting life.

Duffield, *Cranmer*, p. 190. For those who conceived of the real presence in a corporal sense, this is meaningless. It is otherwise for Cranmer.

> of bread and wine, under whose forms the catholic faith teacheth not the body and blood of Christ invisibly to be hidden. And as to the godly eater...the effect is the communication of Christ's body.[75]

Faced with a strong statement of the presence of Christ to the faithful in the Supper, Gardiner, Cranmer believes, can no longer press his objection that for the Archbishop the elements are mere signs: "And now I am glad that here yourself have found out a warrant for the apparel of bread and wine, that they shall not go altogether naked, and be nude and bare tokens, but have promises of effectual signification."[76]

Just as Cranmer insisted on the reality of the sign for the comfort of the receiver and the exercise of faith, he also asserts the equally unquestioned reality of the thing signified. Here he makes his point against the same attack from Gardiner as above:

> Is not one loaf being broken and distributed among the faithful people in the Lord's Supper, taken and eaten of them, a token that the body of Christ was broken and crucified for them; and is to them spiritually and effectually given, and of them spiritually and fruitfully taken and eaten, to their spiritual and heavenly comfort, sustentation and nourishment of their souls, as the bread is of their bodies? And what would you require more? Can there be any greater comfort to a christian man than this? Is here nothing else but bare tokens?[77]

The status of the elements may be defined by a twofold assertion, according to Cranmer: (1) the reality of the sign, and (2) the reality of the thing signified. Thus Cranmer denies a corporal presence--which implies the non-reality of the sign--and a bare memorialism--which implies the non-reality of the thing signified.

---

[75] Duffield, Cranmer, p. 36.

[76] Ibid.

[77] Cox, Writings, pp. 16-17.

> And they be no vain or bare tokens, as you would persuade, (for a bare token is that which betokeneth only and giveth nothing, as a painted fire, which giveth neither light nor heat;) but in the due ministrations of the sacraments God is present, working with his word and sacraments.
>
> And although (to speak properly) in the bread and wine be nothing indeed to be worshipped, yet in them that duly receive the sacraments is Christ himself inhabiting, and is of all creatures to be worshipped. And therefore you gather of my sayings unjustly, that Christ is in deed absent; for I say (according to God's word and the doctrine of the old writers) that Christ is present in his sacraments, as they teach also that he is present in his word, when he worketh mightily by the same in the hearts of the hearers. By which manner of speech it is not meant that Christ is corporally present in the voice or sound of the speaker..., but this speech meaneth that he worketh with his word, using the voice of the speaker, as his instrument to work by; as he useth his sacraments, whereby he worketh, and therefore is said to be present in them.[78]

Cranmer holds strongly to this argument in his counter-attack in the Answer:

> how can he be taken for a good christian man, that thinketh that Christ did ordain his sacramental signs and tokens in vain, without effectual grace and operation? ...the bread [Is not] a vain token, but sheweth and preacheth to the godly receiver, what God worketh in him by his almighty power secretly and invisibly. And therefore as the bread is outwardly eaten indeed in the Lord's supper, so is the very body of Christ inwardly by faith eaten indeed of all them that come thereto in such sort as they

---

[78] Ibid., p. 11.

> ought to do, which eating nourisheth them into everlasting life.[79]

Assurance of life everlasting comes from the reception of both the spiritual body of Christ and the elements:

> ...Christ is in all persons that truly believe in him, in such sort, that with his flesh and blood he doth assure them thereof, as well by the promise of his word, as by the sacramental bread and wine in his holy supper, which he did institute for the same purpose".[80]

The power of the promise is evident here, as well as that of the presence of Christ in the Supper.[81]

The clear relationship between the elements of the Supper and the body and blood of Christ--a unique relationship, as is by now evident--is seen in Cranmer's treatment of "sacramental mutation". The statements of Ambrose on this issue are his starting point:

> And therefore as St. Ambrose...saith, that before the consecration it is bread, and after the consecration it is Christ's body; so in other places he doth more plainly set forth his meaning, saying these words: "Before the benediction of the heavenly words, it is called another kind of thing; but after the consecration, is signified the body of Christ." Likewise, "Before the consecration, it is called another thing; but after the consecration, it is named the blood of Christ."....
>
> By which words of St. Ambrose, it appeareth plainly, that the bread is called by the name of Christ's body after the consecration; and although it be still bread, yet after consecration it is dignified by the name of the thing which it

---

[79] Ibid., p. 17, cf., pp. 34-35, and Duffield, Cranmer, p. 105. Cf. also Cox, Writings, pp. 45-46, where Cranmer accuses Gardiner of limiting the Spirit to baptism and the body to the Supper.

[80] Cox, Writings, p. 52.

[81] Cf. ibid., p. 47.

> representeth, as at length is declared before in the process of transubstantiation, and specially in the words of Theodoretus.[82]

We see here a belief in a mutation of the elements directly related to the presence of Christ in the Supper, though obviously not a substantial mutation. A similar concept is present in the Disputation of Peter Martyr. Indeed, it was noted above that in his case it was also Ambrose whose comments were at issue.

Cranmer comments elsewhere in the Defence that

> Ambrose...saith not that the substance of bread and wine is gone, but he saith that their nature is changed; that is to say, that in the holy communion we ought not to receive the bread and wine as other common meats and drinks, but as things clean changed into a higher estate, nature, and condition, to be taken as holy meats and drinks, whereby we receive spiritual feeding and supernatural nourishment from heaven, of the very true body and blood of our Saviour Christ, through the omnipotent power of God and the wonderful working of the Holy Ghost. Which so well agreeth with the substance of bread and wine still remaining, that if they were gone away, and not there, this our spiritual feeding would not be taught unto us by them.[83]

There is no suggestion that the elements undergo a change of substance such as is posited in transubstantiation. The elements are received as real bread and wine, "notwithstanding the sacramental mutation of the same into the body and blood of Christ."[84] Nevertheless,

---

[82] Duffield, Cranmer, p. 182.

[83] Ibid., p. 118. Note that it is by the power of God and the action of the Holy Spirit that the spiritual reception of Christ is accomplished. We find here another point of similarity with the teaching of Calvin and his colleagues. This will be discussed below.

[84] Ibid.

Cranmer agrees with Ambrose, that the

> sacramental mutation declareth the supernatural, spiritual, and inexplicable eating and drinking, feeding and digesting, of the same body and blood of Christ, in all them that godly and according to their duty, do receive the said sacramental bread and wine.[85]

It is for the "godly" that this mutation occurs. The *Answer* reads thus:

> For after consecration the body and blood of Christ be in them but as in figures, although in the godly receivers he is really present by his omnipotent power, which is as great a miracle in our daily nourishing, as is wrought before in our regeneration. And therefore is Christ no less to be honoured of them that feed of him in his holy supper, than of them that be grafted in him by regeneration.[86]

Cranmer's agreement with Ambrose on the matter of a "sacramental mutation" should strengthen the suspicion that Dix's judgment on Cranmer is quite wide of the mark. Suspicion waxes to certainty after an examination of Cranmer's repeated statements of an objective "spiritual" presence. [87] Indeed, it seems clear that the affirmation of the spiritual presence--a presence which to Cranmer is quite objective--is the heart of Cranmer's doctrine of the Eucharist. The sheer weight of his references to this matter point to such a conclusion. If this were not sufficient, there is his exasperation with Gardiner and, later, his judges for their failure to comprehend his teaching correctly. His

---

[85] *Ibid*.

[86] Cox, *Writings*, p. 282.

[87] See Appended Note C for an argument that this is Cranmer's consistent teaching in his post-1546 writings.

Answer makes it plain that on this point above all he wishes to be understood clearly. Apparently, it was precisely this point which was most confusing to those who viewed the question of the presence from a corporal "either/or" stance. Parker may affirm for himself that "when one considers the repeated assertions of Cranmer that Christ's body is in heaven only (summed up finally in the Forty-Two articles, which deny not only a real presence, but its abstract possibility), it is difficult to see how one can meaningfully talk of a doctrine of 'presence' in Cranmer at all.";[88] but to affirm such a position for Cranmer is to take on a large responsibility. It will be clear that so far as Cranmer was concerned, one must speak of a real presence, if the Supper is at all meaningful. Parker may be disturbed that it is not a real corporal presence; but the question at hand is Cranmer's teaching.

As we have noted, there is no possibility of the corporal inclusion of Christ in the Sacrament for Cranmer. But there is a real and objective presence. Cranmer states in the Defence:

> So that although, in truth of his human nature, Christ be in heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father, yet whosoever eateth of that bread in the supper of the Lord, according to Christ's institution and ordinance, is assured of Christ's own promise and testament, that he is a member of his body, and receiveth the benefits of his passion which he suffered for us upon the cross. And likewise he that drinketh of that holy cup

---

[88] Parker, Review of Mass, pp. 134-146.

> in that supper of the Lord, according to Christ's institution, is certified by Christ's legacy and testament, that he is made partaker of the blood of Christ which was shed for us.[89]

That Cranmer believes in the objective presence of Christ--objective in the sense of presence which, while controlled by faith, is effected by God--is clear from the following strong expression of the true participation of the faithful in the body and blood of Christ in the Supper:

> And for this cause Christ ordained this sacrament in bread and wine..., to the intent that as surely as we see the bread and wine with our eyes, smell them with our noses, touch them with our hands, and taste them with our mouths; so assuredly ought we to believe, that Christ is our spiritual life and sustenance of our bodies. And no less ought we to doubt, that our souls be fed and live by Christ, than that our bodies be fed and live by meat and drink.... So that eating and drinking of this sacramental bread and wine is, as it were, a showing of Christ before our eyes, a smelling of him with our noses, a feeling and groping of him with our hands, and an eating, chewing, digesting, and feeding upon him to our spiritual strength and perfection.[90]

Thus to the faithful, Christ is present in the Sacrament.

> And although Christ in his human nature, substantially, really, corporally, naturally and sensibly, be present with his Father in heaven, yet sacramentally and spiritually he is here present. For in water, bread, and wine, he is present as in signs and sacraments, but he is indeed spiritually in the faithful christian people, which according to Christ's ordinance be baptized, or receive the holy communion,

---

[89] Duffield, Cranmer, p. 53.

[90] Ibid., pp. 71-72.

> or unfeignedly believe in him.[91]

Yet this presence is not wholly dependent on the faith of the recipient--though faith is an essential factor. It is effected by "God's word".

> And yet the bread is changed, not in shape, nor substance, but in nature,...not meaning that the natural substance of bread is clean gone, but that by God's word there is added thereto another higher property, nature, and condition, far passing the nature and condition of common bread, that is to say, that the bread doth show unto us, that we be partakers of the Spirit of God, and most purely joined unto Christ, and spiritually fed with his flesh and blood; so that now the said mystical bread is both a corporal food for the body, and spiritual food for the soul.[92]

Richardson has suggested that Cranmer's use of the common Reformation simile of the sun and its rays indicates that Calvin, Bucer, and Cranmer differ essentially on the question of the true participation in the Supper.[93] It is submitted here that, on the contrary, the Cranmerian use of the simile is very much in line with that of Calvin and Bucer. It is suggested that the following quotation is a more accurate example

---

[91] *Ibid*., p. 79.

[92] *Ibid*., p. 108.

[93] Richardson, *Cranmer and Zwingli*, p. 24. Richardson gives the following quotations from Calvin, Bucer, and Cranmer. First Bucer:

> As the sun is truly placed...in one place of the visible heaven, and yet is truly everywhere in the world abroad: so our Lord, although he be comprehended in one place of the secret and divine heaven...yet nevertheless, by his word and holy tokens he is...present truly whole God and man, and therefore in substance in his Holy Supper.

Calvin states:

> For if we see that the sun, in sending forth its rays upon the earth generates, cherishes and invigorates, in a manner, transufuses its substance into it, why should the radiance of the Spirit be less in conveying to us the communion of his flesh and blood?

The quotation from Cranmer is from the Defence (see Duffield, Cranmer, p. 91.):

> Yet if you saist the beams of the sun be of one substance with the sun, who would believe...you. Is the light of the candle the substance of the candle? Is the light of the fire the substance of the fire? Or is the beams [sic] of the sun any thing but the clear light of the sun?

The point which Richardson makes here is that substantial participation is possible for Bucer and Calvin, but not for Cranmer. An objection is registered here to the conclusion that on the basis of the above passages Cranmer, Bucer, and Calvin do not agree on the matter of participation. First, the passage of Cranmer is taken from his lengthy rejection of the corporal presence. He opposes Gardiner thus:

> But if the substance of the sun be here corporally present with us upon earth, then I grant that Christ's body is so likewise: so that he of us two that erreth in the one, let him be taken for a vain man, and to err also in the other.... Therefore I am content that the reader judge indifferently between you and me, in the corporal presence of the sun; and he that is found to err, and to be a fool therein, let him be judged to err also in the corporal presence of Christ's body.

He then calls on Bucer to help Gardiner; for Gardiner had said that Bucer and he concurred on the matter of the Supper as it appeared in their respective criticisms of the Prayer Book. The sentence preceding the above quotation from Cranmer reads thus:

> But master Bucer saith not so much as you do; and yet if you both said that the beams of the sun be of the same substance of the sun, who would believe either of you?

Then follows the quotation employed by Richardson. Two comments may be made: (1) the question at hand in the section of the Defence with which we are dealing is the corporal presence of Christ in the Supper. But the matter at issue in Richardson's treatment is not the denial of the corporal presence but the affirmation of a of the simile:

> They say, that Christ is corporally and really present in as many places as there be hosts consecrated: we say, that as the sun corporally is ever in heaven, and no where else; and yet by his operation and virtue the sun is here in earth, by whose influence and virtue all things in the world be corporally regenerated, increased, and grow to their perfect state; so likewise our Saviour Christ bodily and corporally is in heaven, sitting at the right hand of his Father, although spiritually he hath promised to be present with us upon earth unto the world's end. And whensoever two or three be gathered together in his name, he is there in the midst of them, by whose supernal grace all godly men be first by him spiritually regenerated, and after increase and grow to their spiritual perfection in God, spiritually by faith eating his flesh and drinking his blood, although the same corporally be in heaven, far distant from our sight.[94]

The reality of the presence is clearly affirmed in this example, as it is by Bucer and Calvin--though the corporal presence is explicitly denied by all three.

The faithful receive the body and blood of Christ in the Supper, though not as they receive the elements of bread and wine, i.e. corporally. The reception is nonetheless a very real one for Cranmer:

---

of a true presence. The quotation is therefore misused. (2) The section preceding the quotation in question, it might be argued, indicates that Cranmer is criticizing Bucer for the same thing as he is criticizing Gardiner, i.e. an affirmation of the corporal presence. This is not the case. Cranmer says, "if you both said that the beams of the sun be of the same substance with the sun, etc.", i.e. if anyone said this, he would be wrong. The criticism is not directed toward Bucer. On the contrary, he reminds Gardiner that Bucer holds a position distinct from that of Gardiner.

[94] Duffield, Cranmer, p. 126.0

> ...but they be figures, which by Christ's institution be unto the godly receivers thereof sacraments, tokens, significations, and representations of his very flesh and blood; instructing their faith, that as the bread and wine feed them corporally, and continue this temporal life; so the very flesh and blood of Christ feedeth them spiritually, and giveth them everlasting life.[95]

This true participation in the body and blood of Christ, and the reception of the same, is the teaching of the Fathers. Cyril states, rightly,

> that we may not grossly and rudely think of the eating of Christ with our mouths, but with our faith, by which eating, although he be absent bodily, and be in the eternal life and glory with his Father, yet we be make partakers of his nature, to be immortal, and have eternal life and glory with him.[96]

Elsewhere, Augustine is cited at length. Then Cranmer sums up the matter:

> By all these sentences of St. Augustine, it is evident and manifest, that all men, good and evil, may with their mouths visibly and sensibly eat the sacrament of Christ's body and blood; but the very body and blood themselves be not eaten but spiritually, and that of the spiritual members of Christ, which dwell in Christ, and have Christ dwelling in them by whom they be refreshed, and have everlasting life.[97]

Again,

> ...those that come feignedly and those that come unfeignedly, both be washed with the Holy Ghost, and clothed with Christ; so, in the Lord's Supper, both eat and drink the sacramental bread and wine, but both eat not Christ himself, and be fed with

---

[95] Ibid., p. 166, cf. pp. 171, 173, 175.

[96] Ibid., p. 180, cf. p. 187.

[97] Ibid., p. 202, cf. p. 205.

> flesh and blood, but those only which worthily receive the sacrament.[98]

The reception of Christ, the participation in him in the Supper, is an extraordinarily real concept for Cranmer. This fact ought not to be underestimated.

> And yet as with our corporal eyes, corporal hands, and mouths, we do corporally see, feel, taste, and eat the bread and drink the wine, being the signs and sacraments of Christ's body, even so with our spiritual eyes, hands, and mouths, we do spiritually see, feel, taste and eat his very flesh and drink his very blood.[99]

Yet the reception is not a physical consumption of the substance of the body and blood. The corporal inclusion is denied almost to the same extent as the real spiritual presence is affirmed:

> For I do not say that Christ's body and blood be given to us in signification, and not in deed. But I do as plainly speak as I can, that Christ's body and blood be given to us in deed, yet not corporally and carnally, but spiritually and effectually, as you [Gardiner] confess yourself....[100]

That Cranmer is vitally concerned to convey this teaching of the real presence and participation can be seen in this emotional entreaty from the Answer:

> God grant that, all contention set aside, both the parties may come to the holy communion with such a lively faith in Christ, and such an unfeigned love to all Christ's members, that as they carnally eat with their mouths this sacramental

---

[98] Ibid., p. 207.

[99] Ibid., p. 209, cf. Cox, Writings, p. 15.

[100] Cox, Writings, p. 37.

> bread, and drink the wine, so spiritually they may eat and drink the very flesh and blood of Christ which is in heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of his Father; and that finally by his means they may enjoy with him the glory and kingdom of heaven! Amen.[101]

Cranmer's impatience with Gardiner's failure--deliberate or otherwise--to grasp his point explains the many passages in which he accuses Gardiner of confusing the issue. The issue most often confused by Gardiner--according to Cranmer, if the Answer is an indication--is that of Cranmer's understanding of the real participation in Christ in the Supper. Gardiner is apparently resolved either to read into Cranmer's argument the element of the corporal presence, or to deny that Cranmer affirms any presence at all. Such a tactic brings Cranmer to a statement of strong objection:

> But...you take such a large scope, that you flee from the four proper matters that be in controversy, unto a new scope devised by you, that I should absolutely deny the presence of Christ, and say, that the bread doth only signify Christ's body absent; which thing I never said nor thought...; and my book /Defence/ in divers places saith clean contrary, that Christ is with us spiritually present, is eaten and drunken of us, and dwelleth within us, although corporally he be departed out of this world, and is ascended up into heaven.[102]

Further, the body which is given in the Supper is the same body which died upon the cross, and is given daily in the administration of the Sacrament:

> But although it be one thing, yet it was diversely given. For upon the cross Christ was

---

[101] Ibid., p. 30.

[102] Ibid., p. 12, cf. p. 41.

> carnally given to suffer and to die; at his last supper he was spiritually given in a promise of his death. And yet it is all but one Christ that was promised to die, that died indeed, and whose death is remembered; that is to say, the very same Christ, the eternal Word that was made flesh. And the same flesh was also given to be spiritually eaten, and was eaten in deed, before his supper, yea, and before his incarnation also.[103]

Cranmer will even agree with Gardiner that Christ is truly present in the Sacrament:

> And as for your catholic confession, that Christ doth indeed feed such as be regenerated in him, not only by his body and blood, but also with his body and blood at his holy table, this I confess also.

But he qualifies this statement, as he does every similar affirmation of the true presence, with a denial of the corporal inclusion of the body and blood in the elements.[104] The point is sufficiently clear: Cranmer will affirm the presence of Christ in the Supper. He will affirm an objective presence. But he also affirms that the presence is for the faithful only, and is not a corporal presence:

> ...although Christ in his human nature, substantially, really, corporally, naturally, and sensibly, be present with his Father in heaven, yet sacramentally and spiritually he is here present.[105]

Gardiner is convinced, it would seem from his criticism of Cranmer, that a spiritual presence is not a real presence. Cranmer speaks directly to this attitude in the Answer:

---

[103] Ibid., p. 24, cf. pp. 41, 224-225.

[104] Ibid., p. 45.

[105] Ibid., p. 47, cf. p. 54.

> how sure be you, that Christ is in substance present, because he is truly present? Are you assured that this your doctrine agreeth with God's word? Doth not God's word teach a true presence of Christ in spirit, where he is not present in his corporal substance?[106]

Cranmer had written in the fourth book of the Defence that Christ is present in the elements, but spiritually, for the faithful. This presence was, nevertheless, for him an objective presence. He reiterates his position in the Answer:

> This therefore is the sum of my teaching in this fourth book, that in the true ministration of the sacrament Christ is present spiritually, and so spiritually eaten of them that be godly and spiritual.... For whether Christ be in the sacrament corporally, as you say, or spiritually in them that rightly believe in him, and duly receive the sacrament, as I say, yet certain it is, that there he is not eaten corporally, but spiritually.

Yet he is most certainly received in the elements by the faithful:

> Is not the breaking and eating of the bread, after such sort as Christ ordained, a communication of Christ's body unto us: Is not the cup likewise a communication of his blood unto us? Should not then christian people, according hereunto, in faith feed upon Christ spiritually, believing that as the bread and wine feed and nourish their bodies, so doth Christ their souls with his own flesh and blood?[107]

Finally, on this question of the real participation in the body and blood of Christ in the Supper, Cranmer states that the teaching of the 1549 Book of Common Prayer is in no way contradictory to his belief:

---

[106] Ibid., p. 61.

[107] Ibid., pp. 203-204, cf. p. 219.

> ...but when the bread and wine be eaten and drunken according to Christ's institution, then, to them that so eat and drink, the bread and wine is the body and blood of Christ,.... And therefore in the book of the holy communion, we do not pray that the creatures of bread and wine may be the body and blood of Christ; but that they may be to us the body and blood of Christ; that is to say, that we may so eat them, and drink them, that we may be partakers of his body crucified, and of his blood shed for our redemption.[108]

There is no reasonable argument against accepting the word of Cranmer on this point. So far as the teaching of the true reception of Christ in the Supper--though in a non-corporal fashion--is concerned, the 1549 Prayer Book, the _Defence_, and the _Answer_ are the work of the same consistent scholar.

It has been noted that Cranmer repeatedly asserted the true presence of Christ and the reception of his body and blood in the Supper by the faithful. The role of faith in Cranmer is that which we have noted already in Calvin, Bucer, Bullinger, and Peter Martyr, i.e., it is a controlling factor of reception. Without faith there is no reception of the body and blood of Christ.

> And therefore no man can say or think, that he eateth the body of Christ or drinketh his blood, except he dwelleth in Christ and hath Christ dwelling in him. Thus have ye heard of the eating and drinking of the very flesh and blood of our Saviour Christ.[109]

Faith is thus a qualifying element in the participation in the body and blood of Christ in the Supper.

---

[108] _Ibid_., p. 271.

[109] Duffield, _Cranmer_, p. 61. Augustine is cited on this point, cf. _ibid_., pp.199, 201.

This faith, as in Calvin and his colleagues, is faith in the work of Christ for man:

> ...this spiritual meat of Christ's body and blood, is not received in the mouth, and digested in the stomach, (as corporal meats and drinks commonly be,) but it is received with a pure heart and a sincere faith. And the true eating and drinking of the said body and blood of Christ, is with a constant and lively faith to believe, that Christ gave his body and shed his blood upon the cross for us, that he doth so join and incorporate himself to us, that he is our head, and we his members, and flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bones, having him dwelling in us, and we in him.[110]

This is the basis of Cranmer's numerous expressions of the reception of the elements whole and real, as well as the reception of the body and blood of Christ.

> And as every man is carnally fed and nourished in his body by meat and drink, even so is every good christian man spiritually fed and nourished in his soul by the flesh and blood of our Saviour Christ.
>
> And as the body liveth by meat and drink, and thereby increaseth and groweth..., so the soul liveth by Christ himself, by pure faith eating his flesh and drinking his blood.[111]

The central role which faith plays in reception is evidence of Cranmer's strong opposition to the concept of the Mass as opus operatum. Given the central role of faith for Cranmer in the entire body of the christian faith, it must also take the central role in the reception of the Supper. If the recipient of the body and blood of Christ does not have faith in the work of Christ for him, then the reception is predicated upon a mechanical system which has no relation to the nature of the contact between Christ and the believer. It is a system which works without reference to the recipient, but only with reference to the elements. Cranmer maintains, on the contrary, that faith is absolutely essential to the true reception of the body and blood of Christ.

---

[110] Ibid., p. 74.

[111] Ibid., p. 69.

> But this doctrine, which the holy doctors do teach, is agreeable to holy scripture, necessary for all christian persons to believe for their everlasting salvation, and profitable for their spiritual comfort in this present life; that is to say, that the sacrament of Christ's body and blood in the natures and substances of bread and wine is distributed unto all men, both good and evil which receive it, and yet that only faithful persons do receive spiritually by faith the very body and blood of our Saviour Christ. So that Christ's natural body is not in the sacrament really, substantially, and corporally, but only by representation and signification, and in his lively members by spiritual effectual operation.[112]

The unworthy, that is to say, those whose eating of the elements is not accompanied by faith, do not receive the body and blood of Christ:

> And as he that eateth the bread worthily may be well said to eat Christ and life; so he that eateth it unworthily may be said to eat the devil and death, as Judas did, into whom with the bread entered Satan.[113]

In further comparing the relationship of Calvin and his colleagues to Cranmer, it is interesting to note Cranmer's stress on the nature of the true reception of Christ. He has denied the corporal presence, and affirmed what is for him a very real, objective, spiritual presence of the body and blood in the elements. He explains his position by saying that in the celebration and reception of the Lord's Supper, our minds are drawn away from earthly things, and we ascend to heaven to participate in Christ there. Linked to this concept of a sursum corda in the reception of the Supper is the statement of the working of the Holy Spirit in making such a reception of the body and blood of Christ possible. The work of the Holy Spirit appears to be that of making reception of the objective body and blood of Christ possible.

---

[112] Cox, Writings, p. 283.

[113] *Ibid.*, p. 220, cf. pp. 27, 43, 44.

Commenting on Chrysostom, Cranmer explains:

> Now forasmuch as I have declared at length the nature and kind of these negative speeches,... it is easy hereby to make answer to St. John Chrysostom, who used this phrase of speech most of any author. For his meaning...was not that in the celebration of the Lord's Supper is neither bread nor wine, neither priest, nor the body of Christ,.... But his intent was to draw our minds upward to heaven, that we should not consider so much the bread, wine, priest, and body of Christ, as we should consider his divinity and Holy Spirit given unto us to our eternal salvation....

Cranmer follows Chrysostom in urging us "to lift up our minds from all visible and corporal things to things invisible and spiritual."[114]

With regard to the words, "It is the spirit that giveth life, the flesh availeth nothing", Cranmer expounds thus:

> These words our Saviour Christ spake, to lift up their minds from earth to heaven, and from carnal

---

[114] Duffield, Cranmer, p. 114.

> to spiritual eating, that they should not phantasy that they should with their teeth eat him present here in earth, for his flesh so eaten, saith he, nothing profits them. And yet so they should not eat him, for he would take his body away from them, and ascend with it into heaven; and there by faith and not with teeth, they should spiritually eat him, sitting at the right hand of his Father. And therefore saith he, The words which I do speak be spirit and life: that is to say, are not to be understand, that we shall eat Christ with our teeth grossly and carnally, but that we shall spiritually and ghostly with our faith eat him, being carnally absent from us in heaven.[115]

It appears, then, that Cranmer believes that the elevation of hearts to heaven in the reception of the Sacrament is a clear implication of the nature of the Sacrament. He asserts that God works in the Sacraments through his Holy Spirit to bring about a reception of Christ, and a participation in him, which things are unique to the bread and wine of the Supper. The objective presence of Christ, and the reception of him in faith are thus linked to the activity of the Holy Spirit. Such a link is one of the characteristic teachings of Calvin, Bucer, and Martyr, and is confessed to be present by Bullinger. Cranmer states again that the simple doctrine of the Supper is this:

> that our Saviour Christ, although he be sitting in heaven in equality with his Father, is our life, strength, food, and sustenance, who by his death delivered us from death, and daily nourisheth and increaseth us to eternal life. And in token hereof he hath prepared bread to be eaten and wine to be drunken of us in his holy supper, to put us in remembrance of his said death, and of the celestial feeding, nourishing, increasing, and of all the

---

[115] *Ibid*., p. 146, cf. p. 168.

> benefits which we have thereby; which benefits through faith and the Holy Ghost are exhibited and given unto all that worthily receive the said holy supper.[116]

In view of the statements noted above, Cranmer can only mean that the benefits include the reception of the body and blood of Christ, spiritually but objectively. Here are both sides of his concept of the means of the presence; for on the one hand faith is necessary for the real participation in Christ, and on the other the activity of the Holy Spirit--an activity not controlled by man but God. Thus the worthy recipient accepts the body and blood of Christ. However,

> ...the true worshippers of Christ worship him in spirit, sitting in his high glory and majesty, and pluck him not down from thence, corporally to eat him with their teeth, but "spiritually in heart ascend up", as St. Chrysostom saith "and feed upon him where he sitteth in his high throne of glory with his Father."[117]

Finally, Cranmer sums up his concept of the objective spiritual presence of Christ, his denial of corporal inclusion, and the central idea of the _sursum corda_:

> But all that love and believe Christ himself, let them not think that Christ is corporally in the bread, but let them lift up their hearts into heaven, and worship him sitting there at the right hand of his Father. Let them worship him in themselves, whose temples they be, in whom he

---

[116] Cox, _Writings_, p. 328, cf. Duffield, _Cranmer_, pp., 184-185.

[117] Cox, _Writings_, p. 235.

> dwelleth and liveth spiritually: but in no wise let them worship him as being corporally in the bread.[118]

It has been necessary to quote at length from Cranmer in order to make it clear that the elements of his thought which have been presented are present in his writings to the degree that they may justifiably be considered basic and essential to his concept of the presence of Christ. In so quoting, it is also hoped that the remarkable similarity between Cranmer on the one hand, and Calvin and his colleagues on the other on the aspects of the presence in question has been elucidated.[119] The contention of this work, then, is that Cranmer's concept of the presence is not only not confusing or contradictory, as many think, but clear and plain, when examined with the viewpoint of Calvin and his fellows in mind. Further, it is submitted that that the Book of Common Prayer of 1552 does not contradict this thesis.[120] To that Book we now must address some attention.

---

[118] Duffield, Cranmer, p. 235.

[119] Cf. Brilioth, Faith and Practice, p. 200, for a similar view.

[120] In view of the foregoing discussion, it is difficult to accept J. Ridley's judgment on Cranmer's Eucharistic doctrine. For example, he avers that, "There is considerable difference of opinion today as to the nature of Cranmer's doctrine of the Eucharist; but it is difficult to believe, after reading his Defence..., that it was as high as is often suggested." Ridley, Cranmer, pp. 322-323. This statement appears to be meaningless. Other statements on the issue deserve consideration. "There is, however, considerable doubt as to the opinions with regard to the Eucharist which Cranmer held at this time." Ibid, pp. 279-281. In 1550, J. Ridley states, Cranmer held a doctrine which fell

Hughes notes that the Prayer Book of 1549 had been destined, "from the beginning", to yield to a more radical work.[121] The first Prayer Book failed to achieve success with a wide range of orthodox and Reformed Englishmen.[122] It was necessary, to be sure, either that the doctrine of the Prayer Book be changed, or that it be made more explicit. The latter option was the one adopted. Therefore, the doctrine of the Second Prayer Book is our next concern. The question is this: can any significant alteration of Cranmer's doctrine of the presence of Christ be discovered in the Prayer Book of 1552?

---

short of the "extreme sacramentarian position, and of that of Zwingli, and it may even have fallen short of the modified Zwinglianism of Bullinger and Hooper and their followers; but it went as far as the doctrines of Peter Martyr, farther than those of Bucer, and far beyond Lutheranism." This leaves a rather broad field, it is true. J. Ridley states that Cranmer did not believe in the corporal presence in 1550, and he probably ceased to believe in it in 1546. "But two years later, Cranmer was acting as if he still believed in the Real Presence,..." Ibid. See Appended Note C for a contrasting conclusion on this last point.

[121] Hughes, Reformation, II, pp. 121-122.

[122] Pollard, Cranmer, is of the opinion that the first Book of Common Prayer had been a compromise, "particularly with regard to the Real Presence. Cranmer had given up that doctrine in 1548, and in 1550 during the controversy with Gardiner maintained that it was not recognised--at least not in the sense in which Gardiner interpreted it-- in the Prayer Book." pp. 270-271. While this spare statement of Cranmer's concept of the real presence is weak, Pollard's assertion that the revisions of 1552 seemed designed to clarify and "enforce" the teachings of 1549 is well-founded. Ibid.

A pre-communion exhortation demonstrates the central role of faith for the true reception of the body and blood of Christ:

> Derely beloued in the lorde: ye that mynde to come to the holy Communion of the body and bloud of our sauioure christe, must consider what S. Paul writeth to the Corinthians, how he exhorteth all persons diligentlye to trye and examine themselues, before they presume to eate of that bread, and drynke of that cup: for as the benefite is great if with a truly penitent heart and liuely faith, we receiue that holy Sacrament, (for then we spirituallye eate the fleshe of Christ, drynke his bloud, then we dwel in Christ and Christ in us, we be one with Christ, and Christ with us:

The exhortation makes it plain that only the faithful receive Christ:

> ...so is the daunger great, if we receyue the same unworthely. For then we be giltie of the body and bloud of Christ our sauiour. We eate and drinke our own damnacion, not considering the Lordes body.[123]

The Prayer of Humble Access reveals Cranmer's continuing concern for the true participation in the body and blood of Christ which is unique to the Sacrament, as he revealed it in the first Prayer Book. Thus the passage reads,

> We doe not presume to come to this thy table (O mercyfull Lorde) trustinge in our owne righteousness, but in thy manifold and greate mercies: we bee not worthye so muche as to gather up the cromms under thy table, but thou art the same Lorde, whose propertie is alwayes to haue mercy: grãt us therfore (gracious lord) so to eate the fleshe of thy dere sonne Jesus Christ, and to drinke his bloud, that our synfull bodyes maye be

---

[123] Gibson, Prayer Books, p. 385, and Thompson, Liturgies, pp. 276-277.

> made cleane by his body, and our soules wasched through his most precious bloud, and that we may euermore dwel in him, and he in us. Amen.[124]

Rising, the priest continues:

> Here us O mercyfull father wee beeseche thee: and graunte that wee receyuing these thy creatures of bread and wyne, accordynge to thy sonne our Sauiour Jesu Christes holy institucion, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of his most blessed body and bloud.[125]

Such a statement reflects the attitude towards the presence of Christ in the Supper found in the 1549 Prayer Book, the Defence, and the Answer.

The element of memoria is, nevertheless, more prominent in the second Prayer Book than in the first. The clearest example of this is the alteration of the words said by the priest when the elements are given to the people. In this case they are: "Take and eate this, in remembraūce that Christ dyed for thee, and feede on him in thy hearte by fayth, with thankesgeuing."[126] In view of Cranmer's understanding of the spiritual presence and participation in Christ which is unique to the Supper, this phrase may be construed as quite in keeping with Cranmer's doctrine of the presence.[127] This is further confirmed in the prayer following the administration. The following alternative prayer reads thus:

---

[124] Gibson, Prayer Books, pp. 388-389, and Thompson, Liturgies, p. 280.

[125] Gibson, Prayer Books, p. 389, and Thompson, Liturgies, p. 280.

[126] Gibson, Prayer Books, p. 389, and Thompson, Liturgies, p. 281.

127. Thus Bainton's conclusion that these words are a mixture of "Calvinist" and "Zwinglian" statements is not necessarily accurate. Bainton, Reformation, p. 202.

> Almightie and euerliuing God, we most hartely thanke thee, for that thou dooeste vouchsafe to fede us, which haue duely receiued these holy misteries, with the spirituall foode of the most precious body and bloude of thy sonne our sauiour Jesus Chryst: and doest assure us thereby of thy fauoure and goodnes toward us, and that wee be very membres incorporate in thy mistical body, whiche is the blessed companie of al faithful people.[128]

Finally, the denial of any adoration of the host as containing Christ's body is made absolutely clear--due largely to the thunderings of John Knox--in the final rubric, known as the Black Rubric.

> Wheras it is ordeyned in the booke of common prayer, in the administracion of the Lordes Supper, that the Communicantes kneelyng shoulde receiue the holy Communion: whiche thyng beynge well mente, for a sygnificacyon of the humble and greatefull acknowledgeynge of the benefites of Christe, geuen unto the woorthye receyuer, and to auoyde the prophanacion and dysordre whiche about the holy communion myghte elles ensue. Lest yet the same kneelynge myght be thought or taken otherwyse, we dooe declare that it is not mente thereby, that any adoracion is doone, or oughte to bee doone, eyther unto the Sacramentall bread or wyne there bodelye receyued or unto anye reall and essenciall presence there beeyng of Chrystes naturall fleshe and bloude.

The rubric concl[illegible] with a strong denial of the corporal inclusion of Christ in the Supper, and an affirmation of the presence of the corporal body of Christ in heaven, and thus the continued reality of the signs.[129]

---

[128] Gibson, Prayer Books, p. 390.

[129] Ibid., p. 391.

It is most likely that the Book of Common Prayer of 1549 and that of 1552 reflect the same concept of Christ's presence in the Supper, if they are understood in terms of the "Calvinistic"sense which we have urged throughout. They are not identical works, however. It is generally agreed that the alterations made were directed toward a clarification, for the benefit of the users, of the doctrine of the new service book.[130] Just what one should call this new doctrine has been a matter of dispute. Jasper Ridley, in a sweeping generalization, states that " in the communion service, all traces of the old mass were swept away, along with every prayer or rubric which indicated a belief in the Real Presence."[131] Powicke appears to have made an equally unguarded statement. He indicates that the second Act of Uniformity was the result of two forces: first, a "growing concern with ecclesiastical order involving the discipline of the laity. The second was the desire to interpret the meaning of the Sacrament of the Altar more clearly in a Zwinglian sense."[132]

---

[130] Cf. Pollard, Cranmer, pp. 272-274, and Hughes, Reformation, II, pp. 123-124. Pollard suggests that "the changes effected between 1549 and 1552 were designed to facilitate an accomodation with the Reformed Churches abroad; and this purified Catholic Church was by means of a Reformed General Council to bring the whole of Christendom into a new scriptural unity."

[131] J. Ridley, Cranmer, p. 326. Once more, we must ask if the real presence is not a strong concept not only in Cranmer's thought generally, but in the Book of Common Prayer of 1552?

[132] Powicke, Reformation, p. 87. Objections to the term "Zwinglian" in this context have been noted.

Others have concurred, more or less, with the view suggested here. Some see the influence of Bucer in the second Prayer Book, wishing to trace this influence to Bucer's Censura. This cannot be done with ease.[133]

Dugmore is correct when he states that "Dix was ...naive when he argued that because all hint of transubstantiation was removed from the 1552 rite it can only be regard as expressing what he chose to call 'the Zwinglian belief in the "real absence".' The actual changes made in the Canon in 1552, the words of administration, and the post-communion Prayer of Thanksgiving still express a doctrine which quite un-Zwinglian in tone."[134]

In conclusion, it is submitted that the Book of Common Prayer of 1553 reflects the same concept of the presence of Christ which we find throughout Cranmer's post-1546 writings. Further, this concept is essentially that of the Calvin-Bullinger-Martyr-Bucer constellation--though we cannot say that all these Reformers are exact replicas of each other. To do so would be to compromise seriously the individual nuances of each. But the basic conception of the presence of the body and blood of Christ in a very real, even objective sense, to the faithful--and thus the reality of both sign and thing signified--is common to all. When Cranmer's doctrine is understood in this light, that doctrine becomes not only clearer, but also consistent. Finally, we may say that so far as similarity of ideas on this crucial issue of the Reformation is concerned, we have here an indication of a strong link between the Continental and English Reformations--though we will not go the extreme position of asserting that it is an exclusive relationship. The appeal to the Fathers of both English and non-English extraction by Cranmer will not permit such a conclusion. On the other hand, it is a mistake to make of England an island of wholly separate Reforming activity.

---

[133] Cf. Grimm, Reformation, p. 305.

[134] Dugmore, Mass, pp. 160-161. Dugmore is, once again, misguided in his attempt to show that Cranmer's doctrine is exclusively that of the native English Eucharistic tradition. The similarity of Cranmer, Calvin, Bucer, Martyr, and Bullinger makes such an attempt appear slightly unbalanced. Further, Dugmore's attempt to show that on a comparison with a "true Zwinglian" liturgy, the Prayer Book of 1552 is not "Zwinglian" is not very useful, pp. 164-167. He errs in adducing A' Lasco's Forma ac ratio, the work of one whose position in the "Zwinglian" camp is surely questionable. He argues that "despite the existence of these liturgies, which must have been known to the committee engaged upon the revision of the 1549 Book of Common Prayer, the revisers did not follow them and make the Second Prayer Book into a re-enactment of the Last Supper." pp. 170-171. The fact that a "Zwinglian" liturgy was not directly consulted does not necessitate the conclusion that the Book is not "Zwinglian"--though in fact it was not.

Excursus

The foregoing pages contain conclusions contrary to many of those reached by some scholars of the English Reformation. It is therefore necessary to include in this work a fairly brief discussion of some other views of the matter of Cranmer's doctrine of the presence of Christ.

Selwyn appears to have brought out the source of difficulty for interpreters in delimiting exactly Cranmer's concept of the presence. His words bear repeating:

> ...it is legitimate to ask whether the use of "True Presence" as a technical term contributes much to the understanding of Cranmer's thought, especially when it is contrasted with his earlier belief in the "Real Presence." He certainly used the term, but it is not specially characteristic. He used "spiritual" more often and he was not even opposed to the use of "real", if it was properly understood. As the late Dom Gregory Dix observed, "Cranmer had all the former don's sense of the precise meaning of words".... But it was also his practice to infuse into traditional formulas his own highly specialized meanings--sometimes to the confusion of his modern interpreters.[1]

That there has been difficulty in understanding Cranmer is obvious. Cranmer's interpreters fall into several groups on the question of his concept of the presence, and that of the related issue of the link between the Continental and English Reformation on this important issue. For example, Fr. Clark's object, in his Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation, is, in the words of Dugmore,

---

[1] D. G. Selwyn, Review of *Thomas Cranmer's Doctrine of the Eucharist*, by Peter Brooks, *Journal of Theological Studies*, N.S. Vol. XVI, Part I (April, 1966), p. 23. Nevertheless, it is contended that if one understands Cranmer's writings in the terms of Calvin's categories, they are rather clearer.

> to challenge the contention of "Anglo-Catholic authors" "in attributing a basic Catholic orthodoxy to Cranmer and his fellow-Reformers and in assigning, as a real objective of their doctrinal and liturgical reforms, only the exclusion of certain late-medieval abuses and errors concerning the Mass."[2]

The reviewer of Clark's book includes a treatment of Parker's thesis concerning Cranmer, which--in Dugmore's opinion--reinforces Clark's viewpoint. We have had occasion to challenge both Clark and Parker on the point of their understanding of just what Cranmer's belief in the presence was. Thus it must be stated that both Parker and Clark insist that the presence which Cranmer has in mind cannot be a real presence. The signs are thus unrelated to the body and blood of Christ; and further, reception of the elements is not the reception of Christ in any unique fashion. Thus Parker states,

> But to contemporaries transubstantiation and any other doctrine of the Real Presence in the elements seemed but two species of one genus, and in Cranmer's mind it was in passing over to a symbolist view that he had crossed the great divide.[3]

Parker seems to adhere to the view that Cranmer was a "symbolist" in the teeth of Cranmer's repeated and vehement denials to Gardiner that he never held the signs to be mere symbols. Parker further asserts that any presence, according to Cranmer, may be, "in effect merely a relationship set up between the communicant and Christ's body in heaven."[4] We may legitimately understand this rather vague statement in terms of Parker's judgment of Cranmer as a symbolist. In this case, we must disagree. Fr. Clark also contends that Cranmer cannot be placed under a Catholic rubric:

---

[2] C. W. Dugmore, Review of Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation, by Fr. Clark, Journal of Theological Studies, N.S. Vol. XIV, Part I (April, 1963), p. 228.

[3] Thomas Parker, Review of Mass, Dugmore, p. 137.

> It may be arguable that Cranmer's theory of the sacrament was different from Zwingli's and nearer to Bucer's or Calvin's; but even if that were proved, it still would not reconcile his opinions about the Eucharistic presence with Catholic doctrine, still less would it "raise serious doubt" about the interpretation of his attitude to the sacrifice of the Mass.[5]

Before noting the arguments of Dugmore, which are opposed by Parker and Clark, we should introduce the matter of the relationship of the English and Continental Reformations. McLelland, as we have noted, sees the influence of Peter Martyr as practically determinative of the sacramental doctrine of the English Church. It clearly follows that he argues for a very close relationship between the two movements, and is opposed to such as Dugmore who imply the undesirability of that influence.[6] Such a view has the attraction--aside from its rather overstated claim for the influence of Peter Martyr--of facing quite honestly the fact that help and advice were deliberately sought by the leaders of the English Reformation. Nor does it claim so much as Barclay, who argues for the essential unity of Luther,

---

[4] *Ibid.*

[5] Clark, *Sacrifice*, p. 168.

[6] McLelland, *Words*, p. 37.

Calvin, Zwingli, Bullinger, et. al. Luther and Zwingli could never be convinced that they agreed. Calvin did not agree with Luther. Bucer made many concessions to Luther; but these were concessions of the type we have noted in the dialogue between Arbogast and Sebold--Sebold is ultimately convinced of Arbogast's position. Barclay does argue that Calvin influenced the English Church considerably, and with this we would have to agree. But in his arguement it is implied that Calvin is only a part of the general Continental unity on the Eucharist--a unity which did not exist so far as Calvin was concerned. We may indeed say that Calvin's concept of the presence appears in Cranmer. But we can hardly say that Luther's also appears.[7]

Watson and Smyth[8] agree that we have evidence of the influence of Continental Reformers, though Smyth believes that influence appears in the form of Bucer, Watson prefers Calvin. We have asserted that both attitudes are essentially correct.

Dugmore feels that this "continental influence" argument is not only overdone, it is totally false. Parker states that "one may cordially agree with our author that the dependence of the English Reformers upon the Continent has been grossly exaggerated, that they had minds of their own and based their teaching upon the interpretation of antiquity."[9] Dugmore's argument with reference to Cranmer is, essentially, this: Ridley converted Cranmer to his doctrine of the presence. Ridley derived that doctrine from Ratramnus of Corbey.[10] Further, Cranmer's doctrine of the presence is derived and rounded out from a study of the Fathers.[11] We may therefore explain the source of Cranmer's doctrine in terms of the fathers of the Church, in terms of Ridley--who himself is related to a distinctively English succession of Eucharistic thought dating back to Ambrose--and conclude that Cranmer was not a rebel from the Catholic ranks, but rather a "Reformed Catholic". Dugmore thus creates an entire party of the Reformation which he calls the "Reformed Catholic" party.[12] Opposed to this party is the Bullingerian group and their followers, who exercise direct Continental influence. The Reformation in England, in other words, is not so much a Reformation as an adherence to an old native tradition of orthodoxy, one distinguishable--so far as the question of the Eucharist is concerned--from that of the Continent. The Reformed Catholic teaching, particularly that of Cranmer, is, according to Dugmore, an assertion of the real presence of Christ in the sense we have argued for here, and a denial of the corporal presence.[13] There are two points to be taken up with

---

[7] On the other hand, we have argued that Cranmer, Calvin, Bullinger, Bucer, and Martyr hold essentially the same doctrine of the presence. There is not clear evidence that all parties mentioned actively communicated their agreement at all times. For example, the letters of Calvin are not really committed on this point. But the attitude among these groups can surely be said to be generally favorable. Thus the argument which has been directed against Barclay's assertion concerning Zwingli, Luther, and Calvin can not be redirected.

[8] Watson, Review of Cranmer, Smyth, and Smyth, Cranmer.

---

[9] Parker, Review of _Mass_, Dugmore, p. 136.

[10] Dugmore, _Mass_, pp. 182-183. [11] _Ibid_., pp. 184-185.

[12] _Ibid_., pp. 149, 182, _et passim_.

[13] _Ibid_., pp. 187, 189ff., 186, 188.

Dugmore: (1) his argument for the exclusively indigenous development of Cranmer's concept of the presence; (2) his understanding of Cranmer's concept of the presence. On the first point we must heartily disagree, while supporting him on the second.

To argue that one can explain completely the development of Cranmer's Eucharistic doctrine in terms of strictly native thought is, in the context of the Reformation, to err. At a period when this specific matter of the Eucharist was a hotly debated topic both on the Continent and in England, it is simply futile to argue that the English Reformation was shut up on the Island. From Henry's first contact with the Lutheran states to Cranmer's arrangment for a pension to be granted to the widow of Martin Bucer, Continental Reformers were not only vitally interested in events in England, but actively participating. There is no question that Cranmer relied a great deal on the fathers for his arguments throughout his life. But, as Parker says, "to read the Fathers and medievals with a mind wholly detached from current and violent controversies is a feat beyond the most independent mind...."[14]

Further, Dugmore is arguing for a specifically Anglican--and in this case Cranmerian--doctrine of the Eucharist. In view of the arguments presented here, such a position has little to recommend it.

As to the second issue, we must reverse our field--except with regard to the fact that while Dugmore accurately describes and analyzes the doctrine of Cranmer, he does not see the close resemblance to Calvin, Bullinger, Martyr, and Bucer. Parker and Clark must be the targets here. Parker asks, "...did the English Reformers teach a doctrine of 'Christ's spiritual, not corporal, real presence'? To anyone who has read them the claim is a startling one."[15] He then quotes a passage of Cranmer's *Answer*. Without reproducing this section again, we may agree with Dugmore that Parker gives only part of the relevant passage.[16]

---

[14] Parker, Review of Mass, Dugmore, p. 136.

> Cranmer...denies Christ is present in the bread by transubstantiation, either corporally or spiritually, but he asserts that he *is* present sacramentally in the bread and spiritually in the faithful partaker. To say, as Dr. Parker does..., that this is "an explicit denial of any presence, other than a tropical one...in the elements" and that "it is difficult to see how one can meaningly talk of any 'presence' in Cranmer at all", is to ignore completely his other statements in his *Answer* to Gardiner....[17]

One can only concur in this argument.[18]

There is some ground for questioning Muller's assertion that Cranmer went through three stages of development, the final one being a rejection of "everything but the spiritual presence of Christ received in the Sacrament by the believer. This was his final view and the one expressed in the volume rebutted by Gardiner."[19] Muller does not give full weight to Cranmer's belief in a very real presence, one uniquely related to the elements--though he makes clear Cranmer's denial of any corporal inclusion. A similar criticism may be applied to Innes' statement that Cranmer "seems to have held that the Presence is not in the elements, but is imparted to the partaker in the act of participation."[20] Nevertheless, Innes is essentially correct in saying that neither Ridley nor Cranmer ever questioned the actual presence of Christ imparted to the recipient; though he seems to precede Dugmore in saying, "wherein they differed completely and effectively from the whole of the Swiss School", if he means Zürich under Bullinger.[21]

---

[15] *Ibid*., p. 135.

[16] See *ibid*. and Dugmore, Review of *Sacrifice*, Clark, pp. 232-233.

[17] Dugmore, Review of *Sacrifice*, Clark, pp. 232-233.

[18] For the sake of brevity, we may add that other scholars have fallen within this interpretation of Cranmer's doctrine, i.e. the affirmation of the real but non-corporal presence. Cf. Pollard, *Cranmer*, pp. 241-243; Hutchinson, *Cranmer*, pp. 126; Muller, *Gardiner*, pp. 129-145; Brooks, *Doctrine*, pp. 72ff, for a statement close to the one suggested here.

The early historians of the English Reformation seem to have been on firm ground so far as Cranmer was concerned, if our conclusions are correct. Cranmer did indeed hold but two doctrines of the presence of Christ in the Supper. The first was orthodox, the second was originally that of Ridley. Burnet describes the situation thus:

> He [Ridley] communicated the matter [his conclusions on the presence of Christ] with Cranmer, and they set themselves to examine it with more than ordinary care. Cranmer afterwards gathered all the arguments about it into the book which he writ on that subject.[22]

The book in question is most likely the *Defence*; therefore, according to Burnet the doctrine to which Cranmer was converted by Ridley was essentially that which he proclaims in the *Defence*. We have attempted to show in Appended Note

---

[19] Muller, *Gardiner*, p. 207.

[20] Innes, *Cranmer*, p. 134.

[21] *Ibid*.

[22] Burnet, *Reformation*, II, p. 197.

C that the doctrine of the Defence is that of Cranmer from 1546, or at the very least from the period preceding the appearance of the Book of Common Prayer. This same point seems to be made by Burnet and Strype, who are dependent on Foxe.[23]

In conclusion, it is submitted that the understanding suggested here may clarify to some extent at least future approaches to Cranmer.

---

[23] See Strype, Memorials, I, p. 368, cf. pp. 96-97.

Appended Notes

Appended Note A

The issue for discussion here is the philosophical-theological arguments presented by the orthodox position, represented by Thomas Aquinas, concerning the presence of Christ in the Eucharist. The reader deserves a few explanatory remarks concerning the approach to the subject. It should be noted that whereas we are concerned with the phrase "presence of Christ", the argument here actually hinges much more on the question of transubstantiation (though the question of the presence is clearly affected). Thus our discussion will center primarily on that problem. The importance of transubstantiation for our question will readily be seen when it is understood that transubstantiation was given official sanction for the purpose of more closely defining what all christians accepted, namely the presence of Christ's body in the Supper, and the means by which this presence came to be. We shall see that the discussion of what happens to the accidents of the bread and wine if their substance is replaced by the substance of the body of Christ is the issue on which the battle is joined. Thus the core of the many-faceted question regarding the presence of Christ in the Supper from a philosophical-theological point of view is really the nature of the relation of the Eucharistic accidents to their substance. Once a theologian had established his position on these matters with regard to the Supper, he could proceed toward a more complete understanding of the meaning of the Eucharist. It should be pointed out, however, that though the Lateran Council of 1215, under the leadership of Innocent III, laid down the doctrine of transubstantiation, there were many interpretations of the doctrine at the time and later. What is more important, many interpretations were allowed to exist.

Further explanatory remarks arise from the choice of Thomas and Occam (in Appended Note B) as representatives of orthodoxy and Nominalism respectively. Presentation of these two not always distinct bodies of thought on the question of the Eucharist will be limited to the two major high medieval schoolmen related to each. One reason is the obvious limitation of space--thus only two. Further, in view of the dominance of Aquinas in the years after his death among the Dominican school, it seems quite feasible (especially from the point of view and interest of the Reformation, which viewed the thirteenth century as a source of corruption on the whole--making it a most significant century) to call Thomas the proponent of the orthodox position on the presence of Christ in the Eucharist. The Dominicans naturally tended to accept and use the doctrines of Thomas. Indeed a series of injunctions by various Dominican Chapters encouraged them to do so.[1]

Prior to the great Summa Theologica we find no fully systematic approach to the aspect of the presence of Christ in the Eucharist. Thomas had takenhis cue from the recently promulgated doctrine of transubstantiation, which somewhat clarified the teaching of the Church on the doctrine of the Eucharist. Yet the question was not completely dealt with. We should note in this regard, and in light of what will be said about Occam, that Duns Scotus had applied the principle of economy, that which was later transformed into the Razor, to the varying ideas about the Eucharist. Despite this apparent harbinger of the use of the principle of economy--Thomas used it as well--Scotus shared the presuppositions of his time.[2]

---

[1] E. F. Sutcliffe, gen ed., The Bellarmine Series XIV; A History of Philosophy Vol. III; Ockham to Suarez, by F. Copleston (8 Vols.; London: Burns Oates and Washbourne Ltd., 1953), p. 10.

We find Thomas' argument on the nature of the Eucharistic presence in the Summa, Part III, the third number, questions Seventy-five and following. Question Seventy-five[3] is concerned with the change of the bread and the wine into the body and blood of Christ. It is divided into eight subordinate questions: (1) whether the substance of bread and wine remain in this Sacrament after the Consecration; (2) whether it is annihilated; (3) whether it is changed into the body and blood of Christ; (4) whether the accidents remain after the change; (5) whether the substantial form remains there; (6) whether this change is instantaneous; (7) whether it is more miraculous than any other change; (8) by what words it may be suitably expressed.

Departing from his first category, Thomas has decided for some reason unknown that it is more important to deal with the question of whether the body of Christ be in this Sacrament in very truth, or merely as in a figure or sign.

---

[2] Cf. Rudolph Damerau, *Die Abendmalslehre des Nominalismus insbesondere die des Gabriel Biel* (Giessen: Wilhelm Schmitz Verlag, 1963), p. 19.

[3] *The Summa Theologica of St. Thomas Aquinas*, trans. Fathers of the English Dominican Province (18 Vols.; New York: Benziger Brothers, 1914), Part III, 3rd number, pp. 262ff.

To the objections offered, which are based on reason, tradition, and scripture, Thomas argues from the same sources and asserts that the sacrifice of the old law contained only in figure that true sacrifice of Christ's passion, and therefore it was necessary that the sacrifice of the new law instituted by Christ should have more value, namely, that it should contain Christ himself crucified, not merely in signification or figure, but also in very truth.[4]

Christ's words, "For This is my Body" (or *Hoc est enim corpus meum*), show incontrovertibly that Christ is present in the Supper. Heretics, notably Berengarius[5]--who was the first deviser of this heresy--speak contrary to Christ's word in saying that Christ is eaten only as a sign. The alternative is a more substantial type of eating of Christ in the Supper.

Thomas now replies to the obvious questions of (a) how Christ can be present in heaven and on earth, and (b) how Christ can be present in many elements at one time.

> Christ's body is not in this sacrament in the same way as a body is in a place, which by its proper dimensions is commensurate with the place; but in a special manner which is proper to this sacrament. Hence we may say that Christ's body is upon many altars, not as in different places, but sacramentally: and thereby we do not understand that Christ is there only as in a sign,

---

[4] *Ibid*., pp. 264-265.

[5] Berengar of Tours held, before his recantation, that Christ meant by these words a figurative meaning, as in the words, This Rock is Christ. Thus Christ was eaten only *in signo*.

> although a sacrament is a kind of sign; but that Christ's body is here after a fashion proper to this sacrament, as stated above.[6]

Thomas must progressively deal with the implications of the idea of the sacramental presence of Christ, notably, what happens to the bread and wine.

Regarding the second question, as to whether the substance of the bread and wine remain in this Sacrament after the Consecration, he says,

> ...some have held that the substance of the bread and wine remain in this sacrament after the consecration. But this opinion cannot stand: first of all because by such an opinion the truth of this sacrament is destroyed, to which it belongs that Christ's true body exists in this sacrament; which indeed was not there before the consecration.[7]

He continues to discuss the presence of a body in a place, with obvious reference to the body of Christ:

> Now a thing cannot be in any place, where it was not previously, except by change of place, or by conversion of another thing into itself; just as fire begins to be anew in some house, either because it is carried thither, or because it is generated there. Now it is evident that Christ's body does not begin to be present in this sacrament by local motion. First of all because it would follow that it would cease to be in heaven: for what is moved locally does not come anew to some place unless it quit the former one. Secondly because every body moved locally passes through all intermediary spaces, which cannot be said here. Thirdly, because it is not possible for one movement of the same body moved locally to be terminated in different places at one time, whereas the body of Christ under this sacrament begins at the one time to be in several places. And consequently it remains that Christ's

---

[6] _Summa_, Part III, p. 266. [7] _Ibid_., p. 267.

> body cannot begin to be anew in this sacrament except by change of the substance of bread into itself. But what is changed into another thing, no longer remains after such change. Hence the conclusion is that, saving the truth of this sacrament, the substance of the bread cannot remain after the consecration.[8]

What Thomas seems to have assumed here is that a change in substance without a change in accidents is possible, and that this change can be wrought without local motion. If this is true, it is not difficult to show that the substance of Christ's body becomes the substance of the bread. Thus Thomas appears to have demonstrated what he set out to show, arriving at the position he had assumed but substantiating it with the help of reason. This can been in the following arguments. He argues that for the bread and wine to remain _qua substantia_ after the Consecration would be contrary to the following: (1) the words of Christ, i.e. "This is my body"; (2) the "veneration of the sacrament"; (3) the teaching of adoration or _latria_;[9] (4)the rite of the Church, "according to which it is not lawful to take the body of Christ after bodily food, while it is nevertheless lawful to take one consecrated host after another."[10] This opinion, then, is avoided as heretical. Christ is not to be eaten as we eat food. It is then his substance which we consume in the Supper. The question remains, however, as to the Eucharistic accidents.

---

[8] _Ibid_.

[9] _Ibid_., pp. 267-268. _Latria_, or the honour and reverence that are due only to God, is opposed in Scholastic and Nominalistic terminology to _Dulia_, honour and reverence due a creature. Cf. H. Oberman, _The Harvest of Medieval Theology_ (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1963), p. 466.

[10] _Summa_, Part III, p. 268.

The third question approaches the matter. It asks whether the substance of the bread or wine is annihilated after the Consecration of this Sacrament, or dissolved into their original matter. The importance of the question, like the former, lies in its implication for the manner of the presence of Christ in the Supper. Boiled down, the question is, can two substances occupy the same space? Thomas, however, does not understand it in this way, and is content to reason that the argument for annihilation of the substances of bread and wine, and the dissolution into original elements, is a false one.

The fourth question, whether bread can be converted into the body of Christ, notes objections raised to the effect that, for example, "if bread be changed into the body of Christ, the form of Christ's body must necessarily begin to be in the matter of the bread, which is false. Consequently, the bread is not changed into the substance of Christ's body."[11] He dispenses with such objections very briefly, though as usual he does not wish to leave out any steps.

> As stated above...since Christ's true body is in this sacrament, and since it does not begin to be there by local motion, nor is it contained therein as in a place, as is evident from what was stated above..., it must be said then that it begins to be there by conversion of the substance of bread into itself.... Yet this change is not like natural changes, but is entirely effected by God's power alone.[12]

He supports this statement with quotations from Ambrose and Chrysostom.

---

[11] _Ibid_., p. 271.

[12] _Ibid_., p. 272.

> The name for this transition is transubstantiation.... This is done by the divine power in this sacrament; for the whole substance of the bread is changed into the whole substance of Christ's body, and the whole substance of the wine into the whole substance of Christ's blood. Hence this is not a formal, but a substantial conversion; nor is it a kind of natural movement: but with a name of its own, it can be called transubstantiation.[13]

As shall be seen, the above quotation is very important because of its emphasis on "substantial" conversion.

The fifth question, whether the accidents of the bread and wine remain in this Sacrament after the change, is significant as well. Four objections are raised, to the effect that since the accidents of bread and wine remain after Consecration, then the substance should not remain, for accidents must adhere in substance. Thomas the Objector sees the issue to be one between faith and reason;

> Although our faith is not subject to reason, still it is not contrary to reason, but above it,.... But our reason has its origin in the senses, as it is when sense judges that to be bread which faith believes to be the substance of Christ's body. Therefore it is not befitting this sacrament for the accidents of bread not to remain.[14]

To this objection Thomas the Apologist replies that, indeed,

> it is evident to sense that all the accidents of the bread and wine remain after the consecration. And this is reasonably done by Divine Providence. First of all, because it is not customary, but horrible, for men to eat human flesh, and to drink blood. And therefore Christ's flesh and blood are set before to be partaken of under the species of these things which are commonly used by men, namely bread and wine. Secondly, lest this sacrament might be derided by unbelievers,

---

[13] *Ibid*., p. 273.

[14] *Ibid*., p. 274.

> if we were to eat our Lord under his own species. Thirdly, that while we receive our Lord's body and blood invisibly, this may redound to the merit of faith.[15]

The supremacy of faith, which is manifestly the faith of the Church here, is acknowledged, and forms the basis of assent to the presence of the substance of Christ's body coterminous with the accidents of bread and wine. Thomas feels that he has adequately dealt with the difficulty posed by the separation of the substance and the accidents in the Eucharist, namely the substance of Christ's body present by transubstantiation under the accidents of the bread and wine. Faith here acts as a signpost to philosophy.[16]

The sixth article is concerned with whether the substantial form of the bread remains in this Sacrament after the Consecration. Thomas mentions that some have argued for the continued presence of the substance of the bread and wine, as well as the accidents. He argues that this is impossible;

> because if the substantial form of the bread were to remain, nothing of the bread would be changed into the body of Christ, excepting the matter; and so it would be changed, not into the whole body of Christ, but into its matter, which is repugnant to the form of the sacrament, wherein it is said: This is My Body.[17]

He further argues that

> if the substantial form of the bread were to remain, it would remain either in the matter, or separated from the matter. The first cannot be, for if it

---

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 275.

[16] Cf. Copleston, *Ockham*, pp. 4ff.

[17] *Summa*, Part III, p. 276.

> were to remain in the matter of the bread, then the whole substance of the bread would remain, which is against what was said above", namely that it does not.[18]

The term "matter", in the above quotation, can be understood here as the materia sacramenti, of the sensible things used in the dispensing of the Sacrament.[19] The substance of the bread cannot exist in the matter of the bread without displacing the authority of scripture, which makes Christ's body the substance in the matter of the bread.

The seventh article asks whether this change is wrought instantaneously, which is not particularly relevant to this discussion.

The eighth question asks whether this proposition is false: the body of Christ is made out of bread. In the Eucharist, the objection is raised, the making of Christ's body out of bread is more miraculous than the creation of the world ex nihilo. Thomas in answering places the weight of his argument on the power of God, and the fact that both are of the supernatural category of transmutation. The objector had asked about various similitudes to express what happens in the Conversion at the Sacrament.

> Nevertheless, since in this sacrament, after the change, something remains the same, namely, the accidents of the bread, ...some of these expressions may be admitted by way of similitude, namely, that bread is the body of Christ, bread will be the body of Christ, or the body of Christ is made out of bread; provided that by the word bread is not understood the substance of bread, but in general that which is contained under the species of bread, under which there is first

---

[18] Ibid.

[19] Cf. R. Defarrari, M. I. Barry, I. McGuiness, A Lexicon of St. Thomas Aquinas (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University Press, 1948), p. 672.

> contained the substance of bread, and afterwards the body of Christ.[20]

We turn now to Question Seventy-six, the first article. The question is asked whether the whole Christ is contained under the elements. Thomas declares,

> it is absolutely necessary to confess according to Catholic faith that the entire Christ is in this sacrament. Yet we must know that there is something of Christ in this sacrament in a twofold manner: first, as it were, by the power of the sacrament; secondly from natural concomitance. By the power of the sacrament, there is uder the species of this sacrament that into which the pre-existing substance of the bread and wine is changed, as expressed by the words of the form [of institution], which are effective in this as in other sacraments; for instance, by the words--This is My Body, or, This is My Blood. But from natural concomitance there is also in this sacrament that which is really united with that thing [i.e. the elements] wherein the aforesaid conversion is terminated. For if any two things be really united, then wherever the one is really, there must the other also be: since things really united together are only distinguished by an operation of the mind.[21]

In Question Seventy-seven, we note the first article, where it is asked whether the accidents remain in the Sacrament without a subject. By subject here is meant substance.[22] Here is the heart of the difference between Thomas and Nominalism as it appears in Occam--one which shall be elucidated in Appended Note B. Thomas can work from the following understanding of ontology, and arrive at the conclusions we have been relating, while Occam cannot, insofar as the power of reason is concerned. Thus Thomas can argue from reason for the nature of Christ's presence, as well as from divine power, while Occam, generally speaking, prefers to place the responsibility for the conclusion more exclusively with God. Thus Thomas:

---

[20] Summa, Part III, pp. 283-284. [21] Ibid., p. 286.

[22] Cf. Defarrari et. al., Lexicon, p. 1060.

> The species of the bread and wine, which are perceived by our senses to remain in this sacrament after consecration, are not subjected in the substance of the bread and wine, for that does not remain, nor in the substantial form, for that does not remain. And if it did remain, it could not be as subject.... Furthermore it is manifest that these accidents are not subjected in the substance of Christ's body and blood, because the substance of the human body cannot in any way be affected by such accidents; nor is it possible for Christ's glorious and impassible body to be altered so as to receive these qualities....
>
> Therefore it follows that the accidents continue in this sacrament without a subject. This can be done by divine power; for since an effect depends more upon the first cause than on the second, God Who is the first cause both of substance and accident, can by his unlimited power preserve an accident in existence when the substance is withdrawn whereby it was preserved in existence as by its proper cause, just as without natural causes he can produce other effects of natural cause, even as he formed a human body in the Virgin's womb....[23]

Thus Thomas' statements and arguments concerning the presence of Christ in the Supper are based on his belief that by the power of God the accidents can continue without a subject or substance. Underlying his argument, furthermore, is the belief in the separate existence of accident and substance, a belief shored up by arguments from reason. This makes possible the doctrine that the substance can be removed without affecting the accidents, as he states.

Absolutely vital to our understanding of Thomas' position is that he is not content to leave the matter there. We have heretofore given in some detail Thomas' teaching on on the presence of Christ in the Eucharist. It seems clear that the basis for his system is the reasoned belief that accidents can exist apart from substance. Once this is granted, it is not difficult to give the skeleton flesh and sinew. But while Thomas believed that accident and substance could exist separately, the accident had to inhere in something. Thus we address ourselves to the problem of quantity.

---

[23] *Summa*, Part III, pp. 306-307.

In Question Seventy-seven, article two[24] Thomas replies to the question of whether in this Sacrament the dimensive quantity of the bread and wine is the subject of the other accidents. He states that

> it is necessary to say that the other accidents which remain in this sacrament are subjected in the dimensive quantity of the bread and wine that remains: first of all, because something having quantity and color and affected by other accidents is perceived by the senses; nor is sense deceived in such.

He further argues that,

> because the first subject is matter, the consequence is that all other accidents are related to their subject through the medium of dimensive quantity; just as the first subject of color is said to be the surface, on which account some have maintained that dimensions are the substances of bodies.... And since, when the subject is withdrawn, the accidents remain according to the being which they had before, it follows that all accidents remain founded upon dimensive quantity.

An objection is stated:

> Further, just as quantity is individuated by substance, so also are the other accidents. If, then, the dimensive quantity of the bread or wine remains individuated according to the being it had before, in which it is preserved, for like reason the other accidents remain individuated according to the existence which they had before in the substance. Therefore they are not in

---

[24] *Ibid.*, pp. 309ff.

> dimensive quantity as in a subject, since every accident is individuated by its own subject.

To this Thomas replies that

> the other accidents [i.e. the qualities] even as they were in the substance of the bread, were individuated by some means of dimensive quantity as stated above. And therefore dimensive quantity is the subject of the other accidents remaining in this sacrament, rather than conversely.

Thus for Thomas, after the Consecration the accidents of the bread and wine, having their substance removed, are upheld by dimensive quantity. The significance of this is that as Thomas understands it, it would be impossible for them to continue to exist otherwise. Moreover, he asserts that our senses do not deceive us, and the accidents are truly extant. Therefore, they must inhere in dimensive quantity. They can certainly no longer exist in substance, for this, by the Church's own hand, has been removed and replaced by the body of Christ. Here is the basis of his Eucharistic ontology--and of the difference between himself and Occam.[25] In the case that a substance is removed from its accidents--which we would consider to include qualities, such as color, and quantities, such as dimensions--Thomas believed that the accidents, which according to medieval philosophy had to inhere in something and could not exist suspended in nothing, could inhere in quantity, which had as its secondary attribute the power to individuate when matter was removed. Our point is that in order for Thomas to be able to suggest such a solution to the difficulty of the continuing presence of the accidents, he had to believe in the distinction between substance and accidents, and between substance and quantity (which was always granted heretofore) and between quantity and quality.

---

[25] Cf. G. N. Buescher, The Eucharistic Teaching of William of Ockham (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University Press, 1950), pp. 12-13.

Appended Note B

We must examine here the Nominalist position--electing Occam as the major representative--and finally Cranmer himself, in order to determine whether Cranmer was a Nominalist. Further, we must decide in what sense we may call him a Nominalist, if indeed he does reflect that position. What, in short, was his relation to this philosophical view of the question of the presence of Christ in the Supper? It is hoped that the intellectual framework of Cranmer's doctrine will be made clearer by this discussion.

In dealing with Thomas, Occam, and Cranmer, we find that in moving from the thirteenth to the sixteenth century a perceptible change in attitude toward the the authority of the Ecclesia Romana on the question of the nature of the Eucharistic-presence is discernible. The nature of this change, and the reason for it on Cranmer's part, is a major interest of this Appended Note.

We turn now to Occam's position. Occam is rightly connected with the radical use of the principle of economy, afterwards known as Occam's Razor.[1] Before examining the implications of Occam's position, let us determine how he arrived at it. He begins by positing a reality, namely a point:

---

[1] This can be briefly expressed thus: "Essentia non sunt multiplicanda praeter necessitatem." Cf. Copleston, Ockham, p. 74.

> A point is not a substance distinct from quantity, nor a quality distinct from quantity, nor a relation distinct from quantity, and so of other respective genera [of Aristotle]; therefore a point is not a thing other than quantity.[2]

He comes to the thrust of the argument by stating that while a point is nothing other than quantity, in that point quantity and substance are not distinguished, nor are quantity and quality. If quantity and quality are not to be distinguished, and if these are accidents, and again, if quantity and substance are not to be distinguished, then on Occam's terms accident and substance are not to be distinguished. Positing the existence of a "point", he argues that one cannot separate the accidents from the subject. In such a "point", substance and accidents occur together. The "point" is not separable into constituent parts of accidents and substance, for what effects one affects the other.[3]

Pursuing his argument, Occam declares,

> I say that quantity is not another absolute thing distinct from substance and quality. But if this same "quality" be substituted for another thing and have precisely the force of the name "categorematic" in signification,[4] it ought to be conceded that any quantity

---

[2] The De Sacramento Altaris of William of Ockham, ed. T. Bruce Birch (Burlington, Iowa: The Lutheran Literary Board, 1930), p. 7.

[3] Damerau, Abendmalslehre, p. 22

[4] "...,some terms refer directly to a reality and have a meaning even when they stand by themselves. These terms ('butter' for instance) are called categorematic terms. Other terms, however, like 'no' and 'every' acquire a definite reference only when standing in relation to categorematic terms, as in the phrases 'no man','every house'. These are called syncategorematic terms." Copleston, Ockham, pp. 53-54.

> is not substance but quality, so that quantity is predicated particularly of substance as well as of quality; for any substance is a quantity, and any quality is a quantity.[5]

Basically this is an application of the Razor to the number of entities within a proposition. Occam continues:

> I further argue that there is not any other quantity except substance or quality; for that is needlessly accomplished through more which can be accomplished through fewer; but all, which can be saved [explained] through such a quantity distinct from substance and quality, can be saved without it, as is obvious inductively. Therefore, such a quantity distinct from substance and quality must not be posited [Igitur talis quantitas distincta a substantia et qualitate non est ponenda]. It can also be proved through these two reasons, that quality is quantity; since this major premise is assumed, that God for this reason can make quality without quantity, if it be another thing, since it may no more depend on quantity than on substance. Similarly, if God can make such quantity, which they posit, without substance; for the same reason he could make quality without quantity, since quality no more depends on quantity than quality on substance.[6]

One can see the implications of this concept of substance when it is compared with Thomas' orthodox understanding. From the point of view of reason, the doctrine of transubstantiation and the understanding of the nature of the accidents of the bread and wine in relation to the substance of Christ's body, present in the Supper after--and by--Consecration, were in grave danger. In fact Occam was brought to the Pope in Avignon to answer charges brought against him by John Lutterell, former Chancellor of Oxford. Occam, sensitive to the problems that his philosophy would present for Church doctrine, claimed that by the rule of faith he would both proclaim that it is possible for God *de potentia absoluta* to create a quantity separate from a substance, and that he will yield to orthodoxy, presenting his arguments as useful for training theologians.

---

[5] Birch, De Sacramento Altaris, pp. 93, 95.

[6] Ibid, p. 107.

> I have fully investigated the questions concerning the Eucharist for the sake of thoroughly examining and explaining them that I may make them known to those not understanding the "quae" and the "qualis" and the "quomodo", and that I have spoken without assertion and only by quoting for the purpose of exercising the abilities of the studious.[7]

He adds, almost reluctantly, " I have undertaken the present task because of the misrepresentation of some critics."

It is, nevertheless, clear that the implications, indeed the very content of his reason leads to a point distant from Thomas; namely, that as the accidents cannot be "held up" in quantity--there being no distinction between substance and quantity, nor between quantity and quality--nor, by everyone's admission, in substance (which is Christ's body here), then Christ cannot be present in the accidents. Therefore what we see in the Supper, the quality and quantity of the bread and wine, is what is truly there. The senses are not deceived. Thus Christ is not in the Supper by transubstantiation, either in substance or in accident.

Before beginning a more complete account of Occam's application of this Nominalist distinction to the Eucharist, it should be made clear that Occam saw his position as being on the whole fully within the Church. At one point in *De Sacramento Altaris*, having stated the credal expression of belief in Christ as the Son of God, etc., he says,

---

[7] *Ibid*., p. 211.

> Moreover, that a perpetual memorial of so great a gift might remain among us and also that Christ might daily be mystically offered as a sacrifice for us who err daily, He left behind His body in the food and His blood in the drink to be received by the faithful in the sacrament of the Eucharist, the unspeakable loftiness of which is deemed an improper subject for human investigation; by virtue of which there is need to speak of this sublime and most excellent sacrament with all fear and modesty; for with respect to no sacrament is error more perilous, nor inquiry more laborious, nor invention more fruitful.
>
> Accordingly, since I am about to examine carefully some views of this worthy sacrament, I protest that I will not assert anything except that which the Roman Church holds and teaches. Moreover, subjecting and exposing myself to the correction of all the skilled, orthodox Catholics who are interested, I shall explain the statements of physics which are to be inserted and whatever statements are in general to be quoted, which are not authorized by the Roman Church, with all humility and modesty, that is, not by rashly approving them but by citing them only for the sake of practice and of inquiring into the truth.[8]

Here is Occam's statement of the orthdox position as he sees it:

> The Catholic Doctors approved by the Roman Church, which have written about the sacrament of the Eucharist, intend to assert this, that the body of Christ which was born of the Virgin Mary, suffered and was buried, which also rose from the dead and ascended into heaven and sits at the right hand of God the Father, and in which the Son of God is about to come to judge the living and the dead, is really and truly contained under the species of bread. But although it may really lie hidden under the species of bread, it certainly is not seen by us with the bodily eye, but with the mind the faithful believe that it is concealed under the species of bread.
>
> And it is also held that the substance of the bread is transubstantiated, converted, or changed, so that the substance of the bread does not remain but that only the

---

[8] *Ibid*., pp. 159, 161.

> the accidents existing per se remain without a subject.
>
> And not only the body of Christ, which is one of the two parts of the human nature is really contained under the species of bread; but also the whole Christ, undivided, perfect God and true man, is at the same time truly and really contained under the entire host and under each part; although by a proper assumption of "conversion" and "transubstantiation", the substance of the bread may not be converted into divinity or rational soul or into some accident.
>
> This is also my faith, since this is the Catholic faith. For whatever the Roman Church explicitly believes, this alone and nothing else either explicitly or implictly I believe.[9]

One could suggest, in view of what we are discussing, that there is discomfort here, though such a suggestion would be beyond proof.

We now turn to the full presentation of Occam's thought on the Eucharist. He begins with some remarks on the Consecration.

> Therefore, when at their words the substance of the bread only ceases to exist, this body of the Lord, which begins to exist under the species of bread by the divine power, is not perceived with the bodily eye but by the eye of faith and understanding. This conclusion is drawn from passages of the Holy Fathers, as well as from arguments.[10]

The efficacy of the words of Consecration is not a matter for dispute here.

We move to the fifteenth chapter, where Occam is ready to discuss the principal thesis, that concerning quantity.

> The quantity [illegible]...in the sacrament of the altar is not an absolute thing really distinct from the qualities remaining with the substance of the body of Christ, and

---

[9] Ibid.,pp. 163, 165.

[10] Ibid., p. 199.

> that before the consecration there preceded some quantity, which was not an absolute thing really distinct from the substance of the bread, which does not remain after the consecration by virtue of this, that the substance of the bread ceases to be.

Occam is bothered by what he is about to say:

> However, I repeat through the testimony advanced in the beginning of this little work, that, although I shall say nothing assertatively except that which the Roman Church teaches, I am prepared in all things to hold in check my inclination by virtue of the authority of the same Church and also to believe with the heart and to confess with the lips the universal truths which the Roman Church expounds or will expound; but others to be cited only, under whatever form of words I shall have expressed them, I shall publicly set forth for the purpose of exercise and of supplying material for thought.[11]

This is an important disclaimer, for it reflects a certain uneasiness with his position. Nevertheless, he perseveres. He presents the opinion of a Doctor, possibly Thomas:

> But if the qualities remaining after consecration could be in a quantity as in a subject, a quantity would be the immediate subject of them and consequently, as long as they would subsist in a quantity, they would not be without an object.

The argument is Thomistic..

> Again, any accident can never be said to be existing *per se*, so long as it subsists in its immediate subject. But according to the same Doctor the qualities remaining in the sacrament of the altar are subsisting *per se*; for when he speaks of qualities of which he spoke before, that they are without a subject he says: "Those accidents, by which the body of Christ having its form and nature is concealed, remain subsisting *per se* at the celebration of the mystery, for the tasting and assent of faith." Therefore it is apparent that this is in accordance with the intention of that Doctor that taste and weight and

---

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 241.

> the like, the qualities remaining in the sacrament of the altar, are subsisting *per se* and without any subject. From which it follows that they do not exist, as in a subject.[12]

We have here the core of the argument, the primary thesis.

> Again there is no stronger reason that one quality may be in a quantity as in a subject, than for another quality; but any quality remaining in the sacrament of the altar is not in a quantity but in a subject. Therefore there is nothing there in a quantity, as in a subject.[13]

Continuing with this point, Occam, after discussing the manner in which such things as heaviness, taste, color, etc., inhere in the Sacrament, he concludes that

> From this it is, furthermore, proper to infer that no quantity there is the subject of that heaviness, and by virtue of that it is necessary to say that no quantity there is the subject of those qualities; but all those qualities there are subsisting *per se* by divine virtue [Sed omnes illae qualitates sunt ibi per se subsistentes virtute divina][14]

Without the support of the idea that the qualities, or accidents, can subsist in quantity, and must do so in the Supper--since the substance of Christ is by ecclesiastical decree the substance of the elements after Consecration--only the power of God can uphold the accidents. "From the preceding statements, it evidently follows that the quantity remaining the sacrament of the altar is not an absolute thing really distinct from the qualities remaining in the same sacrament."

It is clear that throughout his works Occam is arguing for the absolute power of God to do anything he wished--in other words, that his will is superior to his reason. In fact, Occam wrote to establish this point, the superiority of a God *de potentia absoluta* to a God *de potentia ordinata*. With this assumption in mind, one can see that while Occam is treading thin ice in the eyes of the Church from the point of view of reason, or *de potentia ordinata Dei*, he has no difficulty in asserting a position diametrically opposed to the one he has so carefully established. This appears to be the case in the following passage, in which he seems to contradict his own argument:

---

[12] *Ibid*., p. 269.

[13] *Ibid*., p. 271.

[14] *Ibid*., p. 285.

> This can be manifestly true, "no quantity is really the same as substance"; for when it is assumed that God can thus bring it to pass, that it may not have part separate from part in situation, as in a mode of the body of Christ which is under the species of bread; then this is true, "no substance is a quantity"; and some quantity is not really the same as substance.[15]

We have seen, nevertheless, that from the point of view of Occam's reason, the Thomistic synthesis, whereby reason, authority, and revelation decree the same laws, falls apart. It does seem that Occam is aware of what he is doing.

> And indeed although many may hold the opposite opinion proposed, it is not necessary to condemn this opinion, especially since it may thus concur with the statements of Saints and Doctors accepted by the Church. Yet I confess this, that if it could be able to be shown that it may be from the mind of any Doctor accepted by the Apostolic See, that quantity is another absolute thing really distinct from substance and quality, I am prepared to defend and to hold this, although I am unwilling by the virtue of the dictum of any one of the plebs, to hold in check my intellect and to affirm something contrary to a dictate of reason, unless the Roman Church may teach that this view must be held; for the authority of the Roman Church is greater than the whole capacity of human genius.[16]

---

[15] *Ibid*., pp. 403, 405.

[16] *Ibid*., p. 451.

Furthermore, as we have seen, Occam felt that what could not be done de potentia ordinata, nor understood as possible by the human mind, could be done de potentia absoluta Dei.

> And indeed it can be said,...that God has ordained that all things apparent to the sense, which are done about the host when not consecrated, may also be done about the host when consecrated. And indeed those, which can not be done by created power, He has arranged to do immediately through Himself. From the previous statements it can be concluded how those accidents remain at the same time, although they may not be in some one subjectively nor one by the subject of another; for whether it may be able or not to be done by created virtue, there ought not to be doubt but that it can by done by divine virtue.[17]

Having presented the arguments from reason, and the strengthened reliance on God and the authority of the Church of Occam, some conclusions must be drawn. The first is that for Occam the real presence of Christ is not comprehended by reason. Rather it is through faith that the corporal presence is known.[18]

A second conclusion is that Occam was in real danger of heresy. Thus when he demonstrated that quantity is not different from substance or quality, he implicitly rejected Thomas' explanation for the continuing presence of the accidents in the Supper. For while the subject of the elements was the substantial body of Christ, for Thomas the accidents remain, upheld by quantity, in which the accidents of the bread and wine inhered. However, when it had been shown that quantity was not different from either substance or accident; and further that quantity was a quality and no other thing than a quality; and also that therefore quantity and quality were accidents; then it was impossible for the accidents to continue to subsist, inherent in a quantity. They could not, according to Thomas, adhere in the substance, for the accident derives its nature from the substance. In this case the substance was the body of Christ, of which the bread and wine were manifestly not accidents. The accidents--in order for Occam to maintain orthodoxy--were existent _per se_, upheld by the power of God, _de potentia absoluta_. They were not upheld by quantity. This opinion, as we have seen, diverges from that of Thomas.

---

[17] Ibid, pp. 477, 479.

[18] Cf. Damerau, Abendmalslehre, p. 22.

Thirdly, Occam's position is that substance is inseparable from accidents. There is no distinction between substance and accident, if we accept these arguments. The accidents of the bread and wine are present in the Supper, accidents which we perceive since we are not deceived by our senses. Thus the substance of the bread and wine are present in the Supper both before and after Consecration, since accident and substance are inseparable. Christ's body is there in substance, nevertheless, not by reason, but _de potentia absoluta_. The teaching of the corporal presence of the body and blood of Christ in the elements is unacceptable to reason, but reason is defeated by the power of God, which makes possible the co-existence of two bodies in the same place.[19]

We have thus far examined the Eucharistic doctrine of Occam in order to understand more completely the possibility that Thomas Cranmer was in some sense a Nominalist. We move now to a discussion of this question. We begin with a brief review and evaluation of two representative opinions on the Nominalism of Cranmer, those of McGee and Courtenay.[20] McGee argues for Nominalism in Cranmer. He defines sixteenth-century Nominalism as it appears in Cranmer as not merely a set of theological and philosophical positions, but as "a method of approach in theology and philosophy which is non-metaphysical in character, that is, one which does not abstract from notions of time and space."[21] Cranmer opposed transubstantiation, saying that "substance was made up of its accidents and any change of substance would necessitate a change of accident",[22] for accident and substance were mutually effected. Here is a position identified with that of Occam, that is, the quantity and quality are not different from the substance. The two are discussed as though they were one. Here especially is the link with Nominalism. Such a conviction may well have arisen out of his training at Cambridge, where he studied philosophy and logic. This must mean that he read Peter of Spain, a "fount of nominalism". He would also know of Scotus, Durandus, and Biel, and we know that he had a copy of Occam's works in his library. Cranmer realized[23] that these Nominalists, although they could not accept transubstantiation by reason, assented to the doctrine because it was approved by the Roman Church, "although the contrary by the papists' own confession appears to be more easy, more true, and more accurate to the scripture."[24]

---

[19] _Ibid_., p. 23.

---

[20] E. K. McGee, "Cranmer and Nominalism", Harvard Theological Review, Vol. LVII (July, 1964), pp. 189-216; W. J. Courtenay, "Cranmer as a Nominalist--sed contra", Harvard Theological Review, Vol. LVII (October, 1964), pp. 367-380.

[21] McGee, "Cranmer", p. 190.

[22] Ibid., p. 193.

[23] Cf. Cox, Writings, pp. 302, 305.

Cranmer further objected to transubstantiation, as we have seen, on the grounds that Christ's body could not be in two places simultaneously. In so arguing, he appeals to a first principle of the Nominalists of his day, that of non-contradiction. One cannot hold one opinion and its opposite at the same time.[25] (We have seen that Occam's understanding of the power of God enabled him to hold two contrary understandings of the presence of Christ in the Supper, one of which relied on the absolute power of God.) Arguing thus, Cranmer came in for some heavy criticism from Gardiner, Smyth, and Reginald Pole, who accused him of putting reason before faith--a charge, incidentally, from which Occam had exonerated himself two hundred years before. McGee feels that Cranmer is also innocent of this charge, but for different reasons. Cranmer was no "eighteenth-century rationalist", putting reason as the rule of faith. Rather he subordinated reason to faith by use of the "nominalist principle that God's will was superior to his reason."[26] But Cranmer arrived at different final conclusions regarding the Eucharist than did Occam, who as we have noted believed that the work of God _de potentia absoluta_ was superior to the work of God _de potentia ordinata_.

According to McGee's argument Cranmer further demonstrates Nominalist thought in his use of quantitative exclusion. In other words, this is the argument which is implicit in the true understanding of substance, namely that two substances cannot occupy the same space. Thus it was necessary for both Thomas and Occam to maintain only one substance in the Supper. One possible expression of this principle occurs in connection with the relationship of universals and individuals. The Nominalists held that it was impossible for an individual entity to continue to be individual if it participates in a universal. Gardiner argues against this point in the matter of the Eucharist, and Cranmer defends it. Gardiner states that the Fathers used the words "sign", "figure", and "token", but this did not mean "exclusion" of the body from the Supper.[27] Cranmer replies that Gardiner and the Fathers use this principle of quantitative exclusion themselves; for they insist that Christ is but spiritually present, which must mean that the body is excluded. This is the principle of quantitative exclusion, whereby in our discussion either a spiritual or a corporal body can be present, but not both.

---

[24] Cf. McGee, "Cranmer", p. 201. [25] _Ibid_.

[26] _Ibid_.

This quantitative exclusion is applied not only to space but to time, i.e. the sacrifice of Christ occurred only once in the past, and cannot occur again, on the principle of temporal quantitative exclusion. In pressing this point, says McGee, Cranmer presents his third point, mutual exclusion. The bread and the wine occupied their definitive space, and no other substance could exist there. The bread/wine and the body/blood were therefore mutually exclusive.

---

[27] Cf. *Ibid.*, p. 208.

Thus Cranmer's arguments concerning the Eucharistic presence were placed in quantitative Nominalist terms, according to McGee, in which case he was talking on a different wave length than Gardiner, Smyth, and the Catholics; for they were firmly entrenched in a realist rationale.

Courtenay attempts to refute McGee's position by asserting that in the matter of transubstantiation the Nominalists remained orthodox. They established that the accidents inhere in something, that is, do not exist apart from their substance, and are identical with it. However, one could state that the accidents were upheld by the power of God, as we have seen. If one believed this there were, generally speaking, three alternatives: (1) reject transubstantiation; (2) reject the concept of substance; (3) accept transubstantiation as a miracle. Occam and Biel opted for number three. Courtenay therefore argues that the quantity-substance identification is not Nominalist.[28] This seems rather weak. Whether or not the authors of the distinction choose to accept the implications of their work with regard to established teaching is quite beside the point. Their distinctive contribution remained, and Cranmer agrees with their reasoning. Even though the Nominalists submitted to Church authority, admitting that they must limit their reason in the face of Church doctrine, the reasoning remains, is still Nominalist, and is still used by Cranmer.

We turn to the arguments of McGee. It appears that these arguments, couched as they are in general terms of Nominalism, are the correct view of Cranmer's Nominalism as far as it goes. It seems, however, that two points can be made. The first is that, although he gives us an account of the substance-quality-accident argument, he does not attach to it the importance which it deserves. If one is going to speak in terms of substance, quality, and quantity, as McGee does, then the weight of the argument ought to rest on the significant difference in the concepts involved between the orthodox and the Nominalist schools, in view of the preceding conclusions.

---

[28] Courtenay, "Cranmer".

Secondly, McGee does not deal with a question that would seem to be obvious in view of the matter before us. Why is it that Occam feels constrained to accept the authority of the Church on the problem of the continuing presence of the accidents, while Cranmer so obviously does not? The question may become clearer and more pressing when it is recalled that their arguments are really quite similar. Why do they come to such radically different conclusions? We shall deal with this matter in the succeeding section.

Let us now describe Cranmer's position on the issue.

> First the papists say, that in the Supper of the Lord after the words of consecration (as they call it), there is none other substance remaining but the substance of Christ's flesh and blood, so that there remaineth neither bread to be eaten, nor wine to be drunken. And although there be the colour of bread and wine, the savour, the smell, the bigness, the fashion, and all other (as they call them) accidents or qualities and quantities of bread and wine, yet (they say) there is no very bread nor wine, but they be turned into the flesh and blood of Christ.[29]

It is important to note that Cranmer here speaks of quantities and qualities as being in the same category, that of accidents. This is the logical end of Occam's reasoning.

---

[29] Duffield, Cranmer, p. 76.

> And this conversion they call transubstantiation, that is to say, turning of the substance into another substance. And although all the accidents, both of the bread and wine, remain still, yet (they say) the same accidents be in no manner of thing; but hang alone in the air, without any thing to stay them upon. For in the body and blood of Christ (say they) these accidents cannot be, nor yet in the air, for the body and blood of Christ and the air, be neither of that bigness, fashion, smell, nor colour, that the bread and wine be. Nor in the bread (say they) these accidents cannot be; for the substance of bread and wine (as they affirm) be clean gone. And so there remaineth whiteness, but nothing is white: there remaineth colours, but nothing is coloured therewith: there remaineth roundness, but nothing is round: and there is bigness, and yet nothing is big: there is sweetness, without any sweet thing: softness, without any soft thing: breaking, without any thing broken: division, without any thing divided: and so other qualities and quantities, without any thing to receive them. And this doctrine they teach as a necessary article of our faith.[30]

Here is empiricism in the Occamist sense, that is, the telling blow to the subject-accident division. Cranmer has clearly rejected universals. He criticizes the Catholic position by this parody on universals, in which he reduces the concept to absurdity.

One may ask why it is that although we have here the logical conclusion to Occam's arguments about transubstantiation, conclusions which Occam himself refused to draw, we see in Occam's case acceptance of the Church's doctrine on the basis of its authority, while with Cranmer we certainly do not? I suggest that it is because of differing attitudes toward the Church, i.e. the _Ecclesia Romana_. The point may be obvious, but is certainly important if we are to understand Cranmer's position with regard to Nominalism.

---

[30] _Ibid._, pp. 76-77.

> But it is not the doctrine of Christ, but the subtle invention of Antichrist, first decreed by Innocent the Third and after more at large set forth by school authors, whose study was ever to defend and set abroad to the world all such matters as the Bishop of Rome had once decreed. And the Devil by his minister Antichrist, had so dazzled the eyes of a great multitude of Christ's people in these latter days, that they sought not for their faith at the clear light of God's word, but at the Romish Antichrist, believing whatsoever he prescribed unto them, yea though it were against all reason, all senses, and God's most holy word also.[31]

Thus one should take the words of Christ as the true authority:

> If Christ would have had us to believe as necessary article of our faith, that there remaineth neither bread nor wine, would he have spoken after this sort, using all such terms and circumstances as would make us believe that still there remaineth bread and wine? What manner of teacher make they of Christ that say, he meant one thing, when his words be clean contrary? What Christian heart can patiently suffer this contumely of Christ?[32]

The Roman doctrine is, furthermore, against all reason:

> Natural reason abhorreth vacuum, that is to say, that there should be any empty place, wherein no substance should be. But if there remain no bread nor wine, the place where they were before, and where their accidents be, is filled with no substance, but remaineth vacuum, clean contrary to the order of nature.

Cranmer then argues from experience. If Christ's substance is that of the elements, why do the consecrated elements become corrupt? "We see also that the wine, though it be consecrated, yet will it turn to vinegar, and the bread will mould, which then be nothing else but sour wine and moulded bread, which could not wax sour nor mouldy, if there were no bread nor wine there at all."[33] His argument is that if the substance of the bread and the wine is absent, why do the bread and wine act as though their substance were there--a substance which is identical with accidents of quantity and quality?

---

[31] *Ibid.*, pp. 77-78.

[32] *Ibid.*, p. 84.

He moves then to philosophical argument:

> And most of all, it is against the nature of accidents to be in nothing. For the definition of accidents is to be in some substance, so that if they be, they must needs be in something. And if they be in nothing they be not.[34]

Thomas had argued that the accidents inhere in quantity, and could thus remain what they were after Consecration. Occam argued that as quantity was not different from substance this was impossible. The accidents inhere in nothing and are upheld by the power of God, de potentia absoluta. Cranmer has not availed himself of Occam's way out. Rather, taking Occam's position on the accidents, he draws the conclusions which we have seen, supporting them with a vitriolic attack on the Roman Church for deceiving so many christians.

Thus from Cranmer's point of view, as well as that of Scotus and Biel and Occam, transubstantiation had been upheld because the Church taught it. He cites Scotus and Biel as saying that transubstantiation is "received of all them that be Catholic", though "the words of scripture might be expounded more easily and more plainly without transubstantiation."[35] Cranmer, without the weight of the Church to determine what he ought to believe, is turned back to reason, but not reason alone. For him reason was informed by faith, as in fact it was for the schoolmen and the Nominalists. The significant point, however, is that reason was informed by faith without the pre-judgment of the Church.

---

[33] Ibid., p. 85.

[34] Ibid, p. 86.

> Thus you have heard the cause, wherefore this opinion of transubstantiation at this present is holden and defended among the Christian people; that is to say, because the Church of Rome hath so determined; although the contrary, by the papists' own confession, appear to be more easy, more true, and more according to the Scripture.[36]

What would be the situation if one were to continue to hold to Roman doctrine, but unable to appeal to the authority of the Church for support? Such was the situation for the English Catholics after the Supremacy Acts:

> But because our English papists (who speak more grossly than the Pope himself, affirming that the natural body of Christ is naturally in the bread and wine) cannot nor dare not ground their faith concerning transubstantiation upon the Church of Rome;...because, I say, the English papists dare not now establish their faith upon that foundation of Rome, therefore they seek fig-leaves, that is to say, vain reasons gathered of their own brains, and authorities wrested from the intent and mind of the authors, wherewith to cover and hide their shameful errors.[37]

The contrast between the English Catholic position on transubstantiation and Cranmer's belief will be better understood if we first note their common point, namely that for two different reasons they both effectively have given up the right to appeal to the authority of Rome in supporting their arguments. Yet Cranmer rejected the doctrine of transubstantiation and the concomitant understanding of the accident-substance relationship, while Gardiner, Smyth, and their colleagues retained it. Cranmer feels that he can accuse the English papists of relying only on their own devices.

---

[35] Ibid., pp. 101-102.

[36] Ibid., p. 102.

[37] Ibid.

The situation illuminates Cranmer's relation both to Nominalism and to the doctrine of transubstantiation. It is clear that his reasoning is Nominalistic, and that he provides the conclusions to which Occamist arguments would have drawn him--from the standpoint of reason. In this sense he is certainly a Nominalist. Here he diverges from the English Catholics, who did not accept the Nominalist arguments, feeling that they were not consonant with the will of the Church. Cranmer, having made the point that it was the will of the Church which demanded acceptance of a doctrine which Occam showed could not be supported by reason, and having already rejected the authority of the Church, accepted his own arguments from reason without in the end sacrificing them to the Church, as Occam and Biel did.

We conclude, therefore, that Cranmer accepted Nominalist criticism of transubstantiation, and can in this sense, and in this sense only , be called a Nominalist. But further, he rejected the authority of the Church, thus making the stand he took consistent with reason and his concern for the promulgation of the truth of Christ untainted by human authority.

Appended Note C

We present here an examination of Cranmer's progress in Eucharistic doctrine, beginning with a treatment of his orthodox period. By "orthodox" is meant, in this section, the belief in both transubstantiation and the corporal presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Supper. However, it will be apparent when we come to the question of Cranmer's opinions between 1538 and the end of the decade that this definition will change to one including only the corporal presence, in the sense of the inclusion of the body and blood of Christ in the elements.

It is clear that Cranmer held orthodox views on transubstantiation and the real presence between 1533 and approximately 1538. Gilpin asserts that Cranmer's "difficult" circumstances" during this period made that reforming activity he did undertake the more outstanding; "...for except in the matters of supremacy, and transubstantiation, the king and he had very different sentiments on every topic of religion."[1] A more recent authority, Jasper Ridley, confirms this opinion as to Cranmer's orthodoxy in the matter of the Eucharist. The instance of Cranmer's interview with John Frith, June 1533, indicates that Cranmer found Frith's opinions to be heretical.[2] Foxe, Burnet, and

---

[1] W. Gilpin, The Life of Thomas Cranmer (London: Printed for R. Blamire, In the Strand, 1784), p. 63.

[2] J. Ridley, Cranmer, p. 67.

Strype all report that on this occasion Cranmer exhibited strictly orthodox opinions. The Archbishop's own opinion on Frith appears in a letter, dated 17 June of the same year. Referring to Frith, he tells Hawkins, his correspondent, that Frith

> Thought it not necessary to be believed as an article of our faith that there is the very corporal presence of Christ within the host and sacrament of the altar, and holdeth of this point most after the opinion of Oecolampadius.[3]

Frith was brought before Cranmer soon after. He expressed his concern that the article of transubstantiation was "no necessary article of faith." From his prison cell, he argued,

> I grant that neither part [transubstantiation nor the corporal presence] is an article necessary to be believed, under pain of damnation, but leave it as a thing indifferent, to think thereon as God shall instil in every man's mind, and that neither part condemn other for this matter, but receive each other in brotherly love, reserving each other's infirmity to God.[4]

Cranmer disagreed strenuously, and Frith was eventually burned as a heretic.

Hilaire Belloc, in a most vitriolic treatment of Cranmer, argues that at the time of the trial of Frith, Cranmer was actually in agreement with Frith.[5] This suggestion is not only false, but seems to be intentionally malicious.[6] Rather, the Frith episode gives us a clear picture of the orthodox Cranmer.

---

[3] Cox, _Writings_, p. 246.

[4] See Mason, _Cranmer_, pp. 123-124.

[5] Hilaire Belloc, _Cranmer_ (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1931), p. 124.

[6] Cf. _ibid_., p. 126 for similar absurdity.

There is no evidence to indicate that Cranmer's opinion had openly changed between 1533 and 1537. One event of interest in this period was the creation of the Bishops' Book (published in 1537), a statement of doctrine related to that of the Ten Articles of the preceding year. Cranmer was very much involved in the formulation of the doctrine contained in the Book. Nichols adduces Foxe's statement regarding the doctrine therein:

> .../The Reforming bishops/, being convinced by the word of God and consent of the old authors and primitive church, agreed upon and set their hands to a godly book of religion called the bishops' book, not much unlike the book set forth by...king Edward VIth, except in ii points; the one was the real presence of our saviour Christ's body in the sacrament of the altar, of the which opinion the said archbishop was at that time, and the most part of the other bishops and learned men.[7]

We find no indication that Cranmer had withdrawn from the orthodox conservative group until 1537.

In this year Cranmer was in correspondence with the Swiss Reformer Joachim Vadianus on the matter of the real presence. Vadianus had written a treatise on the matter, Six Books of Aphorisms.[8] Strype indicates that this treatise was "intended to prove no corporal presence. This book he presented to the archbishop."[9] Cranmer, after studying the work, replied in a letter to Vadianus. We note the salient points of the letter.[10] Cranmer commends

---

[7] Narratives of the Days of the Reformation..., ed. J. G. Nichols (London: Printed for the Camden Society, 1884), N.S. Vol. 37, pp. 223-224.

[8] See Strype, Memorials, I, pp. 94-95. [9] Ibid.

[10] The full text appears in ibid., II, pp. 741ff.

Zwingli , Oecolampadius and other Reformers in their work of confuting "Papisticos et Sophistocos errores et abusus." But he notes, with Jerome, "et fortasse illud D. Hieronymi de Origene elogium in illos quoque non absurde aliquis detorserit, 'Ubi bene, nemo melius, &.'[I.e., sc. " and where bad, none worse]." But Cranmer is not won over. The Swiss have thrown out the baby with the bath. They erred grievously when they questioned a doctrine so well founded in Church tradition as the corporal presence.

> Quamobrem quum haec, quam tenemus, Catholica fides de vera praesentia corporis tam apertis ad manifestis scripturis fuerit Ecclesiae ab initio promulgata, et eadem postea, per primos Ecclesiasticos scriptores, fidelium auribus tam clare, tamque studiose commendata, ne quaeso, ne mihi pergatis eam tam bene radicatam et suffultam velle amplius convelere aut subruere, satis jam satis tenetatum est hactenus.[11]

The letter does indicate that Cranmer's position remained orthodox at least on the matter of the corporal, substantial presence of Christ in the elements. He was also conscious of "Papistical and sophistical errors and abuses" with regard to the Sacrament; but that the reference here is to transubstantiation is arguable. It could be a reference to many abuses of the Supper, the correction of which did not necessitate a denial of transubstantiation.

The presence of the delegation from Saxony, headed by Burckhardt, in England in 1538, was occasion for another glimpse--a very obscure one--at the Archbishop's opinion on these matters. One Atkinson was tried by Cranmer for heresy concerning the Eucharist. The nature of the heresy is quite unclear, and for this reason we shall not stay long on the episode. Atkinson recanted, and was sentenced to carry his fagot at St. Paul's Cross. Burckhardt intervened on behalf of Atkinson. He requested that Cranmer allow Atkinson to carry the fagot at his own parish church instead of so public a place as St. Paul's Cross. Cranmer refused. He told Burckhardt that since "that error of the Sacrament of the Altar was so greatly spread abroad in this realm, and daily increasing more and more", Atkinson should recant before the largest possible audience.[12] It appears that Cranmer held so strongly to the orthodox opinion of the Eucharist--though what aspect of that opinion is relevant here is impossible to say--that he desired to make something of an example of Atkinson. It would be hazardous to attempt to deduce more from this episode.[13]

---

[11] *Ibid*.

Further light on the Archbishop's thought comes from the reports of the trial of John Lambert, September 1538, whom we have discussed. What light can be shed on Cranmer's concept of the presence of Christ in this trial? Strype states that Lambert's argument against the ubiquity of the body of Christ was attacked by Cranmer. He

> fell upon Lambert's reason, which was taken out of the

---

[12] J. Ridley, Cranmer, p. 170; cf. Mason, Cranmer, pp. 107-108, and Le Bas, Cranmer, I, pp. 153-154.

[13] See Ridley's treatment of the issue, and his conclusions that Cranmer had abandoned transubstantiation before or during 1538, but "did not accept the Lutheran position." Rather, "in 1538 he believed in the Real Presence, not by virtue either of transubstantiation or consubstantiation, but by impanation in the sense in which this was accepted by the medieval schoolmen." J. Ridley, Cranmer, p. 170. Ridley adduces no evidence for this except the case of Atkinson. Simply because impanation was a likely alternative--though not the only one--for Cranmer does not force us to draw such a conclusion from the Atkinson case, which is obscure at best.

> Acts of the Apostles, where Christ appeared unto Paul by the way: disputing from that place, that it was not disagreeable to the word of God, that the body of Christ may be in two places at one: which being in heaven, was seen the same time by St. Paul upon the earth. And, said the Archbishop, "If it may be in two places, why, by the like reason, may it not be in many places?"[14]

It appears that the Archbishop agreed to the condemnation of Lambert, a point significant here in that it probably indicates continuing orthodoxy on the question of the corporal presence.[15] A more definite conclusion seem improbable.

The case of Cranmer's treatment of Adam Damplip, the friar of Calais, provides us with a clearer instance of Cranmer's thought. It also indicates, for the first time unequivocally, that he was favorably disposed to one aspect of Reformed Eucharistic doctrine, the denial of transubstantiation. Adam Damplip was attached to the Priory of the White Friars in Calais. In the summer of 1538, he had exposed a fraudulent miracle in Dove's, the prior's Priory. This miracle consisted in showing three hosts covered in drops of blood. The implication of the corporal presence was clear. Damplip was sent to Cranmer for examination at Lambeth. Cranmer's judgment on the matter is contained in a letter to Cromwell, 15 August, 1538. Damplip apparently was being tried for opposition to transubstantiation and the corporal presence. He had stated in a treatise that scripture knew no such term as transubstantiation. Cranmer's judgment was this:

---

[14] Strype, Memorials, I, pp. 93-94.

[15] See Dugmore, Mass, pp. 177ff. and Pollard, Cranmer, pp. 119-120 for a discussion of Lambert's heresy.

> As concerning Adam Damplip of Calice he utterly denieth that every he taught or said that the very body and blood of Christ was not presently in the Sacrament of the Altar, and confesseth the same to be there really; but he saith that the controversy between him and the Prior was because he confuted the opinion of the transubstantiation, and therein I think he taught but the truth.[16]

This is a statement against transubstantiation and for the corporal presence. Does this letter indicate that Cranmer was indeed a Lutheran in 1538? Ridley argues that Cranmer had rejected transubstantiation, but not the corporal presence by 1538. He notes that Foxe asserts that Cranmer was "yet but a Lutheran".[17] This can be taken to mean that Cranmer accepted the real presence, but rejected transubstantiation. The title "Lutheran" and this position were probably thought to be equivalent at the time. Given this understanding of "Lutheran", it would seem that Cranmer could be so labelled.[18]

It is interesting to note that the documents available from this early section of Cranmer's official life relative to our subject indicate conflict on the issue of the real or corporal presence, rather than transubstantiation. Ridley's summary of the relative importance of the two appears to be essentially accurate. An *argumentum e silentio* might contend that Cranmer was already a Lutheran from the time of the letter to Hawkins concerning Frith. This would be weak. Nevertheless, it does appear that Cranmer stoutly maintains the corporal presence, but is relatively silent on the matter of transubstantiation. The major implication here is not that Cranmer attracted the label "Lutheran", but that he remained orthodox on the matter of the corporal presence.

---

[16] Cox, *Writings*, p. 375.

[17] J. Ridley, *Cranmer*, p. 168.

[18] J. Ridley argues that "compared to the Real Presence, transubstantiation was a subordinate issue." Indeed, controversy concerning the Supper until 1547 or 1548 centered on the real presence for the most part. *Ibid*., p. 170.

The strength of Cranmer's assertion of the corporal presence is called into doubt in the case of Cranmer's interview with one Barber, of Oxford, in 1541. Dugmore describes the meeting:

> "The Archbishop disputed again earnestly for that doctrine against this man", says Strype, "yet could not but admire at his readiness in citing his places out of St. Augustin, nor could tell how to confute them, as Mr. Raphe Morice his secretary related afterward to John Fox." One cannot help wondering, indeed, whether Cranmer had not begun to see the writings of the Fathers in a new light ever since his encounter with Lambert.[19]

On the other hand, Cranmer seems to have continued his support of the doctrine of the corporal presence during the period of conservative back-lash accompanying the formulation of the Six Articles of 1539, and the years following. Given the sanctions of the first article, this is hardly surprising. Dugmore insists that, with reference to the Six Articles, "it was not the real presence which Cranmer took exception to, but the prohibition of the marriage of priests and of the administration of the sacrament under both kinds."[20] He notes further that Cranmer may have held the scholastic doctrine of impanation, "but he certainly did not believe in Consubstantiation", as Smyth maintains.[21]

---

[19] Dugmore, Mass, p. 182.

[20] Ibid., pp. 181-182.

[21] Ibid., cf. Smyth, Cranmer, pp. 57-58.

"He still maintained ' the papists' doctrine' of the corporal presence."

A resolution of this difficult period of apparent transition is not what is needed so much as clarity in comprehending it. It is suggested that Cranmer was never pressed to uphold transubstantiation to the degree that he was pressed to uphold the corporal presence. In other words, the debate was about the nature of the real presence. This fact the sources adduced demonstrate. Our point of concentration, therefore, in this attempt to show Cranmer's development on the matter of the Eucharistic debate, is the question of the presence of Christ in the Supper. It follows, then, that we must now examine the continuing belief in the corporal presence in Cranmer's thought. Such a belief can be traced with certainty from the comments on the case of Adam Damplip through to the episode of Barber's examination. This is not to say, however, that he had not held a belief in the corporal presence--without maintaining transubstantiation--before this. But he, apparently, was never forced to express his opinion of transubstantiation before his reply to Vadianus and the Damplip episode. The problem of the real presence was the core of the matter, and thus the object of debate. How long this belief in the corporal presence lasted is our present concern, on the basis of its prominence in Cranmer's thought.

It is submitted, therefore, that the question of whether Cranmer was for a period of time a Lutheran is really the question of whether or not he believed in the corporal presence. We must inquire of him how long he continued to maintain the corporal presence. Thus may we qualify the label Lutheran. The connotations of the label are more misleading than the connotations of the belief in the corporal presence. "Lutheran", it is true, may be applied when we wish to designate the presence in Cranmer of a belief in the corporal presence, and the rejection of transubstantiation. To use the term in any other way is to confuse the issue. For example, the use of "Lutheran" in a description of Cranmer's attitude toward Damplip in any fashion but this is dangerous.

There has, nevertheless, been a debate concerning the possibility of a Lutheran period in Cranmer's life. The question appears to have taken two forms: (1) did Cranmer believe at any time in the corporal presence, while rejecting transubstantiation; (2) was Cranmer at any time under influence from Lutheran teachings. (1) and (2) are not necessarily the same question. Pollard issues a caveat on this matter which is worth noting;

> ...not every one who was called Lutheran in England adopted the doctrines of Wittenberg; the phrase was a generic term to express any sort of hostility to Rome or the clergy, and even the possession of the Bible in English was sometimes sufficient to make its owner a Lutheran suspect. The number of Englishmen who were really Lutherans was probably small.[22]

The Lutheran label--as is the case with the other labels we are considering--really must be used with caution.

On the matter of Cranmer's "Lutheran" period, some have held that it never existed. Mason[23] asserts that though opinion in Cranmer's lifetime held that he had been a Lutheran, it was misinformed. So little sympathy was there for the Lutheran concept of the presence in the Supper, says Mason, that "Ridley affirmed that the Papists and he were more nearly agreed together than either of them was with the Lutherans."[24] Further, "Cranmer never held" the theory of "Consubstantiation." Hutchinson notes that Cranmer asserted at his trial in Oxford that he did not "pass through a Lutheran stage of belief about the sacrament, but, about 1546, went straight from the medieval to his final view."[25] Pollard notes that the use of the term "Lutheran" by "Zwinglians" to describe Cranmer's position is evident as late as December 1548. But the term is merely used to indicate "that he was neither papist nor Zwinglian."[26]

---

[22] Pollard, Cranmer, p. 94, cf. pp. 269-270. Pollard's reluctance to admit foreign influence on the English Reformation should be kept in mind.

[23] Mason, Cranmer, pp. 125-126.

Yet Pollard must also admit that Cranmer passed through a period when he did deny transubstantiation and upheld the corporal presence. Our treatment of the Damplip case surely points to the presence of such a belief.[27] Burnet supports this. As early as the Lambert trial, it is argued, Cranmer was considered to be a "Lutheran." Lambert composed his ten articles for dispute, and handed them over to Taylor. The latter conveyed them to Cranmer: "Therefore Taylor... carried the paper to Cranmer, who was at that time also of Luther's opinion, which he had drunk in from his friend Osiander."[28] Foxe, reported by Burnet, stated that Cranmer replied to Martin's questioning about the Lambert trial thus:

---

[24] _Ibid_.

[25] Hutchinson, _Cranmer_, p. 129.

[26] Pollard, _Cranmer_, p. 236.

[27] Cf. _ibid_., pp. 235-236.

[28] Burnet, _Reformation_, I, p. 402. There is no evidence, other than circumstantial, that Cranmer drank in Lutheranism from Osiander. He might have done so, but more is beyond proof.

> To all this Cranmer answered,...that man never came more unwillingly into a bishopric than he did to his:... that, when he condemned Lambert, he did then believe the corporal presence; which he continued to do, till Dr. Ridley showed him such reasons and authorities as persuaded him to change his mind, and than he was not ashamed to retract his former opinion.[29]

This demonstrates only that Cranmer held the corporal presence, which has never been doubted in this period. It does, however, indicate that Cranmer was questioned at his trial on the matter of the corporal presence in such a manner that it was conceived to be the most important matter before the court. So far as this reply is concerned, Cranmer could be either Catholic or Lutheran, in the sense that Lutheran is used here.[30]

Muller sees in this period of Cranmer's thought a characteristic "not unlike Luther's although he never formulated it in Luther's words...."[31]

A solution to the question of whether or not Cranmer held the corporal presence while denying transubstantiation for a time in the development of his Eucharistic doctrine is within reach. We have already established that he either denied transubstantiation or questioned it so seriously that he could not really affirm it as true doctrine as early as 1538. There is, it appears, no real doubt that, if this is what we mean by Lutheran, Cranmer was, for a time Lutheran. On the other hand, the matter of his final formulation of such a teaching is unclear. That he rejected the corporal presence of Christ in the Supper several years before his trial is clear. Perhaps the most accurate means of dealing with this so-called Lutheran phase is to view it as a period of examination, or research. That Cranmer employed the techniques of the don as a regular means of approach to a difficult problem cannot be doubted. One has only to refer, for example, to the CCCC MS 102, the section entitled *De Re Sacramentaria*, to understand the workings of Cranmer's mind. The work is comprised of the opinions of the fathers, set forth under such rubrics as "Pro transubstantiatione", followed by "contra transubstantiationem". The pages are those of a scholar setting before himself the alternatives.

---

[29] Ibid, II, p. 532.

[30] Cf. Mason, Cranmer, pp. 126-127, and Le Bas, Cranmer, II, pp. 47-48.

[31] Muller, Gardiner, p. 207; and see Grimm, Reformation, p. 296, for the doubtful statement that at the time of his appointment as Archbishop, Cranmer was "a Cambridge scholar with Lutheran leanings...."

The date of *De Re Sacramentaria* is probably to be found between 1540 and 1546.[32] It is interesting that Cranmer's *Seventeen Questions Concerning the Sacraments and the Appointment and Power of Bishops and Priests* of 1540 does not contain a question about the presence of Christ in the Supper. One cannot press the implications too far, especially in view of a conservative atmosphere set by the first of the Six Articles. The question of the presence of Christ might well have been considered a closed one. On the other hand, it is possible that Cranmer may well have been in the process of researching the matter in order to resolve some confusion. The existence of the Commonplace Books may support this view. These Books were, as their title indicates, collections of theological "commonplaces" of the time. As with the De Re Sacramentaria, it is impossible to draw hard and fast conclusions concerning these Books. The best suggestion appears to be that these "commonplaces" were compiled between the mid-1530's and the early 1540's. This places us in the period of so-called Lutheran influence. It also places us in a period about which very little is known with regard to Cranmer's doctrine of the Eucharist. Again, the style of the Books indicate that Cranmer may have been researching the matter. The words of the major Reformers are recorded in these Books, e.g. Luther, Zwingli, Oecolampadius, Brenz, and others.[33] Cranmer follows the technique of quoting one group against another.

---

[32] Cf. Brooks, *Doctrine*, pp. 41-42, where it is asserted that the "thin notebook" served as a blueprint for the *Defence*. Though evidence is slight, it is suggested that the work is from an earlier period. The equal attention to both sides of the argument is indicative of the researches of one who has not made up his mind on the issue, rather than one who iscompiling material for arguments in favor of one point of view. Though Brooks suggests that the patristic quotations of *De Re Sacramentaria* are almost identical with those of the *Defence*, it is contended that the issues in question between 1540 and 1546 for Cranmer and those brought out in the *Defence* are similar enough to require very similar passages. It should be noted that *De Re Sacramentaria* is a very lengthy selection of quotations, one which would be useful in almost any Eucharistic debate.

It is significant in the context of the Eucharistic debate that Luther's tract, "Das dies Wort Christi noch fest Stehen Widder die Schwermgeister", is quoted at length. Two extracts against Zwingli--Cranmer quotes Luther without following his usual procedure of then producing an excerpt from Zwingli--stress two points we have already noted in our discussion of Luther's teaching: (1) the necessity for believing that because the word asserts, "This is my body", we ought to believe that Christ's body is truly present; (2) the power of God to do anything he wishes. Thus if Christ can be born of the virgin, conceived of the Holy Ghost, then why can Christ not be present in the Supper?[34] Two comments may be made on the matter: first, the presence and nature of the Commonplace Books indicate that Cranmer was gathering material for the purpose of study and comparison of present teachings among Reformers.[35] Secondly, Cranmer seems to show more interest in, if not agreement with, Luther's understanding of the presence of Christ in the Supper. If this second point is true, then we may have evidence for the influence of Luther himself, through his writings, on Cranmer. In this case we may answer both questions posed above in the affirmative, i.e. Cranmer did believe for a time in the corporal presence, while denying transubstantiation; and further, he was influenced by Luther's writings. Unfortunately, the evidence on the second point is slight. What is fairly certain, however,--and we must leave the matter here for lack of evidence--is that Cranmer was conducting a program of research on the contemporary Eucharistic debate in scholarly fashion, and did believe in the corporal presence while denying transubstantiation. Whether he thus deserves to be called a Lutheran is possible, but unclear.

---

[33] Brooks, Doctrine, pp. 21 ff.

Cranmer was, to be sure, considered a Lutheran by the more radical of the Reformers, as late as December 1548.

---

[34] *Ibid*., pp. 33-34.

[35] We must point out that the existence of the *Commonplace Books* indicates Cranmer's concern for the Continental Eucharistic debate. Dugmore's thesis suffers, it is suggested, in the face of them.

It is almost certain that such a label was inaccurate at that point. Cranmer had met with Ridley in 1546 and, as he stated in his trial, was persuaded to Ridley's position. That position, as we have noted, was hardly Lutheran. Nonetheless, letters went to Bullinger saying that Cranmer was a follower of Wittenberg. The source of this opinion was a Catechism which Cranmer translated from the Latin into English in 1548. The original was the work of Justus Jonas, a supporter of Luther who had accompanied him to several councils. Ab Ulmis wrote to Bullinger (18 August, 1548), stating that not only was Cranmer attached to Lutheranism, but was attracted to Roman doctrine as well:

> This Tomas has fallen into so heavy a slumber that we entertain but a very cold hope that he will be aroused even by your most learned letter. For lately he has published a catechism, in which he has not only approved that foul and sacrilegious transubstantiation of the Papists in the holy supper of our Saviour, but all the dreams of Luther seem to him sufficiently well grounded, perspicuous, and lucid.[36]

That this report is false in respect of the alleged belief of transubstantiation is obvious. It is clear that Ab Ulmis, and his fellow correspondent Burcher, had picked up gossip to this effect. Furthermore, Ab Ulmis read no English, which circumstance severly qualifies his judgment in this case.[37] Burcher was in Strassburg when he wrote to Bullinger.

We shall note that in December 1548 Cranmer made comments at the debate in the House of Lords which left no doubt that he had denied the corporal presence. Further, in his _Answer_ of 1551 he states that, " I confess myself that not long before I wrote the said catechism, I was in error of the real presence."[38] In view of the discrepancy in reports on the nature of the Catechism; and in view also of the apparent assertion of the reception of the true body and blood of Christ present in the Catechism, some discussion of the issue is required if we are to determine whether there is evidence for Lutheran influence here.

---

[36] Original Letters, II, pp. 380-381. Note Burcher's letter of October 1548, *ibid*., pp. 642-643, where the same message is given to Bullinger.

[37] He may have read the Catechism in Latin, in which case the Lutheran aspect of Cranmer's source would have been obvious. He could not have read the English, however, and it is the English Catechism which is of interest here.

Burton notes that while the difference between "the doctrine expressed by Cranmer in relation to the Real Presence in the English Catechism, and that previously set forth in the original Latin, is so very delicate", one important sentence is omitted from the English. Here is the Latin passage in question:

> Deinde de Pane dicit, _Hoc est Corpus Meum_, et de Calice, _Hic est Sanguis Meus_. Ideo _credere debemus, quod vere Corpus et Sanguis Ejus sit; nam Deus est Omnipotens, ut in Symbolo_ audistis; ideo omnia potest facere, quae vult; et "vocat ea quae non sunt, tanquam sint;" sicut Paulus dicit: *_hoc est quando ipse aliquam rem vocat et nominat, quae ante non erat_,* TUNC MOX FIT HOC IPSUM, SICUT DOMINUS NOMINAT.* Ergo quando accipit Panem et dicit "_Hoc est Corpus Meum_", _tum mox ibi est Corpus Domini_; et quando Calicem accipit, et dicit "_Hic est Sanguis Meus_", _tunc mox adest Sanguis Ejus_. Hoc credendum est nobis, si modo volumus esse Christiani.

Here is Cranmer's translation--with the exception of the omitted passage:

> Secondarily, Christ saieth of the Breade, _This is My_

---

[38] Cox, _Writings_, p. 374.

[39] The phrase between asterisks (*--*) is omitted in the English.

> *Bodye*; and of the Cuppe, He sayeth *This is My Bloud*. Wherefore we ought to beleue that in the Sacrament *we Receyue trewly the Bodye and Bloud of Christ*. For God is Almyghtye, as ye hearde in *the Crede*: He is able therefore to do all thynges what He will: and, as Saint Paul writeth, "He calleth those thynges which be not as if they were." Wherefore, when Christ taketh breade, and saieth, "Take, Eat, THIS IS MY BODY," - *we ought not to doute but we eate His veray bodye*. And when He taketh the cuppe, and sayeth "TAKE, DRYNKE, THIS IS MY BLOUD," - *We ought to thynke assuredly, that we Drynke His veray Blode*. And *This we must beleue* yf we will be counted Christen men.[40]

The emphasis on the belief in the true presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Supper is quite clear, as is the statement that man's reason cannot comprehend how this take place. The omitted phrase from the Latin--"hoc est quando ipse aliquam rem vocat et nominat quae ante non erat, TUNC MOX FIT HOC IPSUM, SICUT DOMINUS NOMINAT"--seems, however, to indicate Cranmer's dislike for an expression of too high a value on the effect of the words of Consecration. A more significant alteration is seen in the translation of the phrase "Ideo credere debemus, quod vere Corpus et Sanguis Ejus sit" with the words "Wherefore we ought to beleue that in the Sacrament we Receyue Trewly the Bodye and Bloud of Christ." The change of emphasis is subtle, but a change it certainly is. The fact that Cranmer would alter an accepted Lutheran Catechism, prepared by a leading disciple of Luther, in a more Reformed direction on the matter of the presence ought to give some basis for doubting Cranmer's status as a Lutheran, i.e. one who believes in the corporal presence

---

[40] "A Bibliographical and Literary Account of the Volume of Religious Instruction for Children, usually denominated Cranmer's Catechism...." (London: Printed as a Memorial Book for the friends of William Tite and Richard Thomson, 1862), pp. 28-30; ital. *ibid*.

--with reference to the Catechism. It would seem, however, that Cranmer is definitely asserting the reception of the true body and blood of Christ. This is clear from the following as well as from passages already noted:

> When ye be asked - "What is the Communion of the Lord's Supper?" Ye may answer - "It is the Trew body and True Bloude of our Lorde Jesus Christe; whiche was ordeyned by Christ Him-selfe, to be eaten and dronken of us Christen people, under the forme of breade and wine."[41]

It is suggested here that it is not necessary to place Cranmer in a Lutheran category simply because he asserts the reception of the true body and blood of Christ in the Supper, under the forms of the bread and wine. By 1548 we have such an argument from Bucer, Calvin, Bullinger, and Peter Martyr. Furthermore, we do see in this Catechism a significant--if subtle--alteration in the translation of the phrase "quod vere Corpus et Sanguis Ejus sit." The translation emphasizes the reception of the true body and blood of Christ in the Sacrament. The emphasis, that is to say, is on the reception, rather than the presence, though the real presence is obviously admitted. The Lutheran form, i.e. Jonas', insists on the point that the body and blood of Christ are present because God is omnipotent. Without detracting from that omnipotence, Cranmer subtly alters the thrust of the statement towards the affirmation of true reception of the body and blood. Such an emphasis is characteristic of other Reformers besides Luther. It is true that this argument is only as strong as the evidence, which is hazy at best in the case of the Catechism. But it does seem misguided to assign Cranmer to the Lutheran group on the basis of this Catechism, when other alternatives are equally open.[42]

---

[41] Ibid., p. 31.

Cranmer himself was sensitive to the possibility that

---

[42] D. G. Selwyn, "A Neglected Edition of Cranmer's Catechism", Journal of Theological Studies, N.S. Vol. XV (April, 1964), pp. 76-91, suggests an interesting solution to another knotty problem concerning this troublesome Catechism. At his examination at Oxford, Cranmer was questioned by Martin thus:

> Martin: When Kyng Henry died, did not you translate Justas Jonas his Book?
>
> Cranmer: I did so.
>
> Martin: Then there you defended another doctrine touching the Sacraments; by the same token that you sent to Lynne your printer: that is to say Christe's Body reallye in the Sacramente,--you sent then to your printer to put in a "Not"; whereby it came miraculously to passe that Christe's Bodye was cleane conveyed out of the Sacrament.
>
> Cranmer: I remember there was two prynts of my sayde booke; but where the same "Not" was put in I cannot tell.

Account, p. 32. Indeed, where the same "Not" was put in, we still cannot tell; but there is reference to two editions. Selwyn asserts that a third edition of the Catechism has been discovered, which sheds light on this matter of the discrepancy between the statements in the Catechism and the statements of the Lords debate of the same year. For example, the first and second editions make the following statement:

> For he doth not only with his bodily mouth receive the body and blood of Christ, but he doth also believe the words of Christ,....

Such a statement, we have noted, affirms a reception of the true body of Christ, though not necessarily the corporal presence. The third edition, however, omits two key words and reads thus:

> For he doth only with his bodily mouth receive the body and blood of Christ, but doth believe the words of Christ.

In other words, believing the words of Christ, one receives the body and blood of Christ, or he believes in the passion and thus enters into communion with Christ. Faith becomes a controlling factor here. On the other hand, the true reception is maintained. There is no reason to assert that there is a denial of any objective presence of Christ. Selwyn states that he might be misinterpreted. He says in his Defence of 1550,

> And in a Catechism by me translated, and set forth, I used like manner of speech [i.e. speech in the manner of Chrysostom, who says "that we see Christ with our eyes, touch him, feel him, and grope him with our hands, fix our teeth in his flesh, taste it, break it, eat it, and digest it, make red our tongues and dye them with his blood, and swallow it, and drink it], saying, that with our bodily mouths we receive the body and blood of Christ. Which my saying, divers ignorant persons (not used to read old ancient authors, nor acquainted with their phrase and manner of speech) did carp and reprehend, for lack of good understanding. For this speech and other before rehearsed of Chrysostome, and all other like, be not understand of the very flesh and blood of our Saviour Christ, which in very deed we neither feel nor see, but that which we do to the bread and wine, by a figurative speech is spoken to be done to the flesh and blood, because they be the very signs, figures, and tokens instituted of Christ, to represent unto us his very flesh and blood.[43]

If Cranmer is being honest in this matter, he was not in a confused or even transitional state when he prepared the Catechism. Rather, he knew exactly what his goal was--an expression of the reception of the body of Christ, "only figuratively". The objective presence and reception of

---

that the effect of these alterations is to "direct attention from the act of the priest in consecration to the work of Christ in communion."

There are, according to Selwyn, five similar changes in the third edition. This edition of the Catechism probably appeared in the autumn of 1548. In December Cranmer provides opinions in the debate which caused many to say that he had come over to a figurative interpretation of the Supper. This matter receives attention below. For a discussion of the accusation that Cranmer incorporated papist engravings in his Catechism, see Account, pp. 35-36.

[43] Duffield, Cranmer, pp. 208-209.

the body of Christ--though clearly not after the manner of an _inclusio localis_--is surely an alternative explanation of his alterations in the text of the Catechism. And it appears to be the explanation which Cranmer himself intended. He reasserts this in the _Answer_.[44] Elsewhere in the same work, he argues thus:

> And in that Catechism, I teach not, as you do, that the body and blood of Christ is contained in the sacrament, being reserved, but that in the ministration thereof we receive the body and blood of Christ; whereunto if it may please you to add or understand this word "spiritually", then is the doctrine of my Catechism sound and good in all men's ears, which know the true doctrine of the sacraments.[45]

The question of the place of the Catechism in Cranmer's development is a very difficult one, as is clear from the above discussion; for the evidence is equivocal. But it is very closely related to the question of the possibility that Cranmer passed through a Lutheran period. This latter question has been taken up in order to establish two points: (1) on the matter of the corporal inclusion, Cranmer remained orthodox throughout whatever Lutheran period he may have passed through. Thus on the question of the corporal presence, there is no evidence--unless the arguments here are completely unfounded on the matter of the Catechism, a tricky source at best--that he publicly held more than one concept of the nature of the presence of Christ in the Supper between 1533 and 1546. (2) If the conclusions which we submit in this work be accepted, we may justly conclude that on the question of the nature of the presence of Christ in the Supper, and on the basis of such evidence as is available, Cranmer held no more than two concepts of the presence of Christ in the Supper from the time he became Archbishop until he was imprisoned under the Marian reaction. We can, then, accept the statement at his trial that he held two, and not three, doctrines of the presence of Christ in the Supper.

---

[44] Cox, _Writings_, p. 14.

[45] _Ibid._, p. 227. Jasper Ridley's suggestion that only by a feat of "casuistry" would it be possible to "reconcile the words of the Catechism with a denial of the Real Presence" is thus unacceptable to the argument suggested here. Further, his guess that Cranmer was "deceiving himself" in 1551 in the _Answer_ when he denied that he taught the "Real Presence" does not take into account the point that affirmation of the real presence and denial of the corporal presence are not incompatible. _Cranmer_, p. 283.

Pollard asserted that "Cranmer never reached the extreme of Zwinglianism."[46] We have already argued that the use of this term with regard to the question of the presence of Christ in the Supper in the context of the Continental Reformation requires serious qualification--which qualification Pollard does not supply. Nevertheless, correspondence of the years 1548-1549 between Bullinger and his allies indicates that common opinion designated the Archbishop a believer of Bullinger's teaching. "You must know", wrote Traheron to Bullinger, "that Latimer has come over to our opinion respecting the true doctrine of the Eucharist, together with the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the other bishops, who heretofore seemed to be Lutherans."[47] Ab Ulmis writes to Bullinger, exclaiming, "Even that Thomas himself, by the goodness of God and the instrumentality of that most upright and judicious man, master John a Lasco, is in a great measure recovered from his dangerous lethargy...."[48]

---

[46] Pollard, Cranmer, p. 228.

[47] Original Letters, I, p. 332, 28 September, 1548.

Peter Martyr adds his acclamations:

> The palm rests with our friends, but especially with the Archbishop of Canterbury, whom they till now were wont to traduce as a man ignorant of theology, and as being conversant only with matters of government; but now, believe me, he has shown himself so mightily a theologian against them as they would rather not have proof of, and they are compelled, against their inclination, to acknowledge his learning and power and dexterity in debate. Transubstantiation, I think, is now exploded, and the difficulty respecting the presence is at this time the most prominent of dispute; but the parties engage with so much vehemence and energy as to occasion very great doubt as to the result; for the victory has been fluctuating between them.[49]

This last reference, though it is unclear on the statements of Cranmer regarding the presence of Christ, refers to the important Lords debate of 14-18 December, 1548. During this debate, those who supported the Zurichian doctrine found cause for encouragement, as Martyr's letter shows. That Martyr and Bullinger would correspond on this important issue in a manner indicating their agreement on the desired result is significant, in view of our comparison of their teachings above. Traheron wrote to Bullinger with regard to the debate on 31 December, 1548:

> On the 14th of December, if I mistake not, a disputation was held at London concerning the eucharist.... The archbishop of Canterbury, contrary to general expectation, most openly, firmly, and learnedly maintained your opinion upon this subject. His arguments were as follows. The body of Christ was taken up from us into heaven. Christ has left the world.[50]

---

[48] _Ibid_., II, p. 383, 27 November, 1548.

[49] _Ibid_., pp. 469-470, 26 December, 1548.

[50] _Ibid_., I, pp. 322-323.

The results of the debate, or more specifically Cranmer's statements at this debate, seem to have set off a wave of speculation that Cranmer had altered his position from "Lutheranism", i.e. from a belief in the corporal presence accompanied by a rejection of transubstantiation, to a teaching in line with that of Bullinger. We have noted that the Catechism may indicate that the question of the corporal presence is dealt with by Cranmer in such a manner that he may have questioned that belief already. To what position did Cranmer come in the debate?

Smyth insists that Cranmer lapsed into a "Zwinglian" view at the time of the debate. Under the influence of John A' Lasco, who is thought to have advised him during the debate, he is said to have arrived at A' Lasco's position. This, according to Smyth, is "Zwinglianism", i.e. memorialism. Although we have already noted that A' Lasco cannot be placed in a "Zwinglian" camp after 1543 with anything like certainty, he is held to have been a significant figure in what is here a very significant event. Therefore, we ought to note, with Smyth, the following statement of A' Lasco's belief:

> We call the symbols of the supper *sphragidas* with Paul, i.e. seals of that very communion, which, when we receive them according to the Lord's institution, being before our eyes in a mystery that same communion and renew it in our minds, and seal us wholly in certain and undoubted faith in it, but the operation of the Holy Spirit, although we place in them no physical or real inclusion of the body or blood of Christ.[51]

Note here that what A' Lasco is denying is the concept of the *inclusio localis*, which is rejected, as we have seen, by every Reformer but Luther. Zwingli is surely not alone on this matter. He also affirms an operation of the Holy Spirit with respect to the elements.

---

[51] Smyth, *Cranmer*, p. 185.

Now what of Cranmer's comments. It is usual among students of this question to quote the Archbishop to the effect that he denies transubstantiation, a corporal presence, and the _manducatio impiorum_. Thus both Smyth and Pollard and other scholars[52] quote the following statements of Cranmer from the text of the debate:[53]

> The eating of the body is to dwell in Chriat, and this, though a man never taste the Sacrament. All men eat not the body in the Sacrament.... Our faith is not to believe him to be in the bread and wine, but that he is in heaven; this is proved by scripture and the doctors, till the Bishop of Rome's usurped power came....
>
> I believe that Christ is eaten with heart.... Eating with his mouth giveth nothing to no man, nor the body being in the bread....
>
> But the Sacrament is the remembrance of this death which made the will good.... The good man hath the word within him....
>
> They be two things to eat the sacrament and to eat the body of Christ.... They eat not the body of Christ but eat their condemnation, for he hath nothing to do with them that are not parcels of his body. They are not fed of him because they dwell not in him.

On the matter of the corporal presence, here an obvious reference to the _inclusio localis_, Cranmer says,

> The Sacrament was ordained not to be eaten of them.... But they say the very body is there when it is hanged up, which is not found in the scripture.... Saint Paul saith, "Panis quem frangimus est communicatio corporis." For Christ when he said this is my body, he meant communionem corporis. For Christ when he bids us eat his body, it is figurative; for we cannot eat his body indeed....

---

[52] Smyth, _Cranmer_, p. 67, Pollard, _Cranmer_, pp. 215-219, and Brooks, _Doctrine_, pp. 47ff.

[53] Originally from Gasquet and Bishop, _Book of Common Prayer_, pp. 397ff.

No man drinketh Christ or eateth him, except he dwell in Christ and Christ in him.

These are the quotations commonly noted to give the thrust of Cranmer's opinion on the presence of Christ in the Supper. Smyth holds that these quotations indicate a lapse into "Zwinglianism". Pollard states that Cranmer gave negative answers to the three questions around which the debate centered, one of which was "whether there was a real presence in the sacrament."[54] This opinion is based on the report of the debate. Brooks[55] states that the debate gave no doubt as to the stand of the Archbishop; that is to say, he was "fully in line with the Swiss position." Brooks is essentially correct in his judgment, in view of his understanding of the obsolescence of the term "Zwinglian". Pollard has simplified the situation, encompassing what we have already seen to be a subtle teaching with the term "real presence". Brooks, too, lacks a clear explanation on this point, though his view is more acceptable than either Pollard's or Smyth's. What is it exactly that Cranmer denies in this debate? It is submitted that his arguments are designed to controvert the limitation of the natural body of Christ to the elements in the Supper. It is the teaching of the inclusio localis which he opposes. A significant quotation from the record of the debate is not given in full by students of this debate, but broken up. A fuller quotation will be beneficial in showing that Cranmer's major concern was a denial of the concept that one finds Christ limited to the elements of the Supper, and thus consumes him.

---

[54] Pollard, *Cranmer*, p. 219.

[55] Brooks, *Doctrine*, p. 48.

CANTOR.

> By Scripture our Saviour Christ is our head, and we his body. The word is in our hearing, in our eyes the Sacrament. Qui manducat carnem meam etc.
>
> They be two things, to eat the Sacrament and to eat the body of Christ. The eating of the body is to dwell in Christ, and this may be though a man never taste the Sacrament. All men eat not the body in the Sacrament. Hoc est Corpus Meum. He that maketh a will bequeaths certain legacies, and this is our legacy, remission of sins, which those only receive that are members of his body. And the Sacrament is the remebrance of this death which made the will good. Indigni iudicium sibi manducant. They eat not the body of Christ but eat their condemnation, for he hath nothing to do with them that are not parcels of his body.
>
> They are not fed because they dwell not in him. It was ordained to be eaten of them that have everlasting life. But they say the very body is there when it is hanged up, which is not found in the Scripture. It is also comfortless while it is his body, for, as soon as you tear the bread with your teeth (they say) the body flies to heaven, for it may suffer no such wrong. And while it is in the bread we have no comfort; (some others say) the body tarrieth in the bread till it come to the stomach, and then ascends to heaven, for it may suffer no wrong of digestion. The body that the just receive continueth still. Our faith is not to believe him to be in bread and wine, but that he is in heaven; this is proved by Scripture and Doctors, till the Bishop of Rome's usurped power came in. Then no man drinketh Christ or eateth him, except he dwell in Christ and Christ in him.[56]

Briefly, what we see is an affirmation of the controlling factor of faith in the reception of the body of Christ in the Supper, and the concomitant denial that Christ is limited to the elements and therefore consumed. Cranmer will go even farther. He states that "The bread that we break is his body even as the cup is his blood."[57] A real presence is possible for the faithful, according to Cranmer. He has not denied all objectivity to the Supper.

---

[56] Gasquet and Bishop, Book of Common Prayer, pp. 400-401.

Such a statement is not the exclusive property of Cranmer. Calvin, Martyr, Bucer, and Bullinger would certainly concur here. Thus to affirm that what occurred in the December debate in the House of Lords was the "lapse" of Cranmer into "Zwinglianism" through the influence of A' Lasco is to simplify to the point of inaccuracy. Thus Cranmer states,

> It was natural bread, but now no common bread for it is separate to another use. Because of the use it may be called bread of life. That which you see is bread and wine But [sic] that which you believe is the body of Christ. We must believe that there is bread and the body.[58]

The truth of the thing signified as well as the sign appears once more; but on this point, it is the expression of a man who is held by some to believe in "bare signs", e.g. Dix.[59] On the contrary, one finds here a possible indication of a developed doctrine of the presence, one which first glimmers in the Catechism, develops its negative aspect in the debate, and moves on to positive and well-rounded expression in the *Defence* and the *Answer*. Further, it is suggested that we are not forced to rely upon an explanation of Cranmer's teaching which has him moving hither, yon, and back. Rather, we have evidence here of Cranmer's agreement with Calvin, Bullinger, Martyr, and Bucer. Finally, if these are "Zwinglian", Cranmer is a "Zwinglian". But the term is so misleading as to be useless by this point.[60]

---

[57] *Ibid.*, p. 401.

[58] *Ibid.*, p. 442.

[59] Dix, *Shape*, p. 656.

Pollard argues that though Cranmer appeared to have accepted a "Zwinglian" view during the Lords debate, he later rejected it. Pollard adduces the following passages to demonstrate that Cranmer "did not sympathise with the extreme Zwinglian view, that bread and wine were 'bare tokens', and nothing more:

> they be...no vain or bare tokens (for a token is that which betokeneth only and giveth nothing, as a painted fire, which giveth neither light nor heat); but in the due ministration of the sacraments God is present, working with his word and sacrament.... The bread and wine ...have promises of effectual significance.... As the bread is outwardly eaten indeed in the Lord's Supper, so is the very body of Christ inwardly by faith eaten indeed of all them that come thereto in such sort as they ought to do, which eating nourisheth them into everlasting life.[61]

In view of the above understanding of Cranmer's statements of the debate of 1548, one need not conclude that the later statements of the *Defence* and those of the debate are incongruous, as Pollard has done. An objective presence is by no means wholly excluded by the former, though there is no doubt that the *inclusio localis* is flatly denied. Again, we found a similar position in the cases of Calvin, Bullinger, Martyr, and Bucer. Thus Pollard has overstated the difference between the debate and the later works in his inference that the debate was not a reflection of Cranmer's final views.

---

[60] The debate between Timms and Dix is, therefore, misguided. See G. B. Timms, "Dixit Cranmer", *Church Quarterly Review*, 143, 144 (1947); and G. Dix, "Cranmer Dixit et non Timuit", *Church Quarterly Review*, 145, 146 (1948).

[61] Pollard, *Cranmer*, p. 241.

Clark is also guilty of simplification on this issue. He notes that it is not Peter Martyr (as McLelland contends) but rather A' Lasco who excercised "the most significant influence on Cranmer's opinions about the Eucharist."[62] He notes also that Cranmer vacillated on the matter of the presence for some time; "but it was not long before he was influenced by a Lasco and Hooper, and by the logic of the Reformation principles, towards the thoroughgoing Zwinglian opinion held by Bullinger of Zurich."[63] If Clark means that it was the view of the Consensus Tigurinus and the Decades of Bullinger which drew Cranmer on, then he is probably correct. A' Lasco is said to have drawn Cranmer to this opinion. However, Clark says this of A' Lasco: "More radical than Bucer, he was instrumental in swaying his host toward the Zwinglian doctrine of the sacrament, as held by Bullinger." What is meant by "more radical than Bucer" is not at all clear. On essential doctrines of the presence, A' Lasco and Bucer have, indeed, much in common, as we have seen.

Dugmore has subordinated the actual thrust of the comments of the debate to his overall thesis that the Reformation in England is a purely domestic product. He argues that Cranmer's apparently conflicting statements in the four days of the debate indicate confusion. When Cranmer said, on the second day of the debate, that "eating with his mouth giveth nothing to no man, nor the body being in the bread", we hear

> the voice of Tyndale, A Lasco, and the sacramentarians, not of Frith, Lambert and the Reformed Catholics. That

---

[62] Clark, Sacrifice, p. 120. [63] Ibid.

> he was confused in his own mind is evident from the fact that he also stated, even on the first day, "The bread that we break is his body even as the cup is his blood."[64]

It is suggested that this is not evidence of confusion in Cranmer's mind, but rather evidence of alternating emphases. Thus on the one hand Cranmer denied the inclusio localis: "eating with his mouth giveth nothing to no man, nor the body being in the bread." On the other, he affirms the presence of Christ in the Supper for the faithful, as we have seen. For them, in the Sacrament, "The bread that we break is his body even as the cup is his blood." It is not necessary to fall back on a suggestion that Cranmer was confused. The example of Calvin, Bucer, Bullinger, and Martyr--the denial of the inclusion of the body in the elements and the affirmation of the presence for the faithful--is another alternative. Indeed, the comments of Cranmer indicate that it is a very attractive alternative.

The arguments of Dix, to the effect that Cranmer became a "Zwinglian", i.e. a believer in memorialism, will be seen to be unacceptable to the argument suggested here.[65] Richardson's brief and incisive attempt[66] to distinguish Cranmer's belief from Zwingli's is effective. He argues that the difference between Zwingli and Cranmer is a qualitative one, i.e. Zwingli gives less importance to the elements than Cranmer.[67] However, the point at issue is whether there is a "Zwinglianism" upon which Cranmer can draw at the time of the Lords debate and afterwards. Zwingli had been dead for seventeen years, and Bullinger was very much in charge in Zürich. A comparison between Zwingli and Cranmer is interesting. But whether it is useful in a discussion of affairs after 1547 is doubtful. Again, we must argue that the question of whether or not Cranmer is a "Zwinglian" is a misleading one. The term "Zwinglian" as it appears in the writings of such Anglo-Catholics as Dix is most certainly a loaded one. Moreover, it obfuscates the issue--which issue is the point of relationship, if any, between Cranmer's beliefs and those of his active contemporaries. He was, by 1548, in the process of preparing the service book for the Reformed Church of England. The opinions of his contemporaries, both in England and on the Continent, were of interest to him as a scholar, as the Commonplace Books indicate. The opinions of the fathers were of interest, for they had unquestioned authority with him, as his De Re Sacramentaria shows. But that he should be concerned with the thought of a leader of the Reformation, to the exclusion of all others, whose doctrines had undergone considerable change--e.g. the Consensus Tigurinus--and whose mantle had fallen on his active, experienced, and intelligent successor before Cranmer considered the possibility of preparing any service book at all is a suggestion meriting little attention--though it has received much.

---

[64] Dugmore, Mass, p. 129.

[65] Dix, Shape, pp. 646-656.

[66] Richardson, Cranmer and Zwingli.

[67] For an opposing view, see Dugmore, Mass, p. 184.

It is equally doubtful that he should be concerned with the opinions of the Fathers to the exclusion of his vociferous contemporaries.

Selected Bibliography

Book of Common Prayer

Brightman, F. E. *The English Rite*. 2 Vols. London: Rivingtons, 1915.

Gasquet, Francis A., and Edmund Bishop. *Edward VI and the Book of Common Prayer*. 2nd ed. London: John Hodges, 1891.

Gibson, E. C. S. *First and Second Prayer Books of Edward VI*. London: Everyman, 1910.

Thompson, Bard. *Liturgies of the Western Church*. Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, 1964.

Martin Bucer

Bucer, Martin. *Martini Buceri Opera Omnia*. Series I: *Deutsche Schriften*. Ed. Robert Stupperich. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1960-.

Eells, Hastings. *Martin Bucer*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1931.

Harvey, A. Edward. "Martin Bucer in England." Inaugural-Dissertation zur Erlangung der Doctorwürde der Hohen Philosophischen Fakultät der Universität Marburg. Marburg: Buchdruckerei Heinrich Bauer, 1906.

Hopf, Constantin. *Martin Bucer and the English Reformation*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1946.

Van De Poll, G. J. *Martin Bucer's Liturgical Ideas*. Groningen: Van Gorcum & Comp. N. V. - G. A. Hak & Dr. H. J. Prakke, 1954.

Rupp, Gordon. Review of *Martin Bucer and the English Reformation*, by Constantin Hopf. *Journal of Theological Studies*, Vol. XLVIII (1947).

Heinrich Bullinger

Bullinger, Henry. *The Decades of Henry Bullinger*. Trans. H. I. Ed. for the Parker Society by Thomas Harding. 4 Vol. Cambridge, England: The University Press, 1849-1852.

________. *A Most excellent Sermon of the Lordes Supper*. Trans. I. T. [John Tomkys]. London: printed for William Ponsonby, 1577.

________. *Reformationsgeschichte*. Ed. J. J. Hottinger and H. H. Vögeli. Frauenfeld: Druck und Verlag von Ch. Beeil, 1838.

Leith, John H. , ed. *Creeds of the Churches*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1963.

John Calvin

Beckmann, Joachim. *Vom Sakrament Bei Calvin: Die Sakramentslehre Calvins in ihren Beziehungen zu Augustin*. Tübingen: Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1926.

Calvin, John. *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. Vols. XX-XXI of *The Library of Christian Classics*. Trans. F. L. Battles. London: S. C. M. Press, 1961.

________. *Trois Traités*. *Oeuvres de Jean Calvin*. Ed. Albert-Marie Schmidt. Vol. II. Paris: Editions "Je sers", 1934.

McDonnell, Kilian. *John Calvin, the Church and the Eucharist*. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1967.

Wallace, Ronald S. *Calvin's Doctrine of the Word and Sacrament*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1957.

Wendel, François. *Calvin*. Trans. Philip Mairet. London: Collins, 1963.

Thomas Cranmer

Belloc, Hilaire. *Cranmer*. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1931.

"A Bibliographical and Literary Account of the Volume of Religious Instruction for Children, usually denominated Cranmer's Catechism.... London: printed as a Memorial Book for the friends of William Tite and Richard Thomson, 1862.

Bromiley, G. W. *Thomas Cranmer, Theologian*. London: Oxford University Press, 1956.

Brooks, Peter. *Thomas Cranmer's Doctrine of the Eucharist*. London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1965.

Collette, Charles Hastings. *The Life, Times, and Writings of Thomas Cranmer, D. D*. London: George Redway, 1887.

Courtenay, W. J. "Cranmer as a Nominalist--*sed contra*." *Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. LVII (October, 1964).

Cranmer, Thomas. *All the Sybmyssyons, and Recantations of Thomas Cranmer....* London: "Excusum Londoni in aedibus Iohannis Cawodi", 1556.

________. "De Re Sacramentaria". Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. Parker Collection. MS 102.

________. *Miscellaneous Writings and Letters*. Ed. for the Parker Society by John Edmund Cox. Cambridge, England: The University Press, 1846.

________. *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*. London: "Londoni Ex officina Johannis Daii...1571..."

________. *The Work of Thomas Cranmer*. Ed. G. E. Duffield. Intro. by J. I. Packer. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1965.

________. Writings and Disputations of Thomas Cranmer. Ed. for the Parker Society by John Edmund Cox. Cambridge, England: The University Press, 1844.

Dix, Gregory. "Cranmer Dixit et non Timuit." Church Quarterly Review, 145, 146 (1948).

Gilpin, W. The Life of Thomas Cranmer. London: printed for R. Blamire, In the Strand, 1784.

Hutchinson, F. E. Cranmer and the English Reformation. London: English Universities Press Ltd., 1951.

Innes, Arthur D. Cranmer and the Reformation in England. New York: Charles Scriber's Sons, 1900.

Le Bas, Charles W. The Life of Archbishop Cranmer. 2 Vols. New York: J. & J. Harper, 1833.

McGee, E. K. "Cranmer as a Nominalist." Harvard Theological Review, Vol. LVII (July, 1964).

Mason, Arthur James. Thomas Cranmer. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1898.

Maynard, Theodore. The Life of Thomas Cranmer. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1956.

Pollard, A. P. Thomas Cranmer and the English Reformation. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1906.

Porter, H. C. Review of Thomas Cranmer, by Jasper Ridley. Journal of Theological Studies, N.S. Vol. XIV, Part II (October, 1963).

Richardson, C. C. Zwingli and Cranmer on the Eucharist (Cranmer Dixit et Contradixit). Evanston, Ill.: Seabury-Western, 1949.

Ridley, Jasper. Thomas Cranmer. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962.

Selwyn, D. G. "A Neglected Edition of Cranmer's Catechism." Journal of Theological Studies, Vol. XV, Part I (April, 1964).

________. Review of *Thomas Cranmer's Doctrine of the Eucharist*, by Peter Brooks. *Journal of Theological Studies*, N. S. Vol. XVI, Part I (April, 1966).

Smyth, C. H. *Cranmer and the English Reformation under Edward VI*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1926.

Strype, John. *Memorials of...Thomas Cranmer....* 2 Vols. "A New Edition, with Additions." Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1812.

Styron, Arthur. *The Three Pelicans: Archbishop Cranmer and the Tudor Juggernaut*. New York: Harrison Smith and Robert Haas, 1932.

Timms, G. B. "Dixit Cranmer." *Church Quarterly Review*, 143, 144 (1947).

Watson, E. W. Review of *Cranmer and the English Reformation under Edward VI*, by C. H. Smyth. *Journal of Theological Studies*, Vol. XXVIII (1927).

English Reformation

Burnet, Gilbert. *The History of the Reformation of the Church of England*. Ed. and rev. Nicholas Pocock. 7 Vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1865.

Dickens, A. G. *The English Reformation*. London: B. T. Batsford Ltd., 1964.

________. *Thomas Cromwell and the English Reformation*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1959.

Hughes, Philip Edgcumbe. *The Reformation in England*. 3 Vols. London: Hollis and Carter, 1950-1954.

Nichols, J. G., ed. *Narratives of the Days of the [illegible].... Reformation....* London: printed for the Camden Society, Vol. 77, 1859.

Pocock, Nicholas, ed. *Troubles Connected with the Prayer Book of 1549*. London: printed for the Camden Society, N. S. Vol. 37, 1884.

Powicke, F. Maurice. *The Reformation in England*. London: Oxford University Press, 1941.

Robinson, Hastings. *Original Letters Relative to the English Reformation. . . .* Ed. for the Parker Society. 2 Vols. Cambridge, England: The University Press, 1847.

English Reformers

Dalton, Hermann. *Johannes a Lasco*. Gotha: Friedrich Andreas Berthes, 1881.

Greenslade, S. L. *The English Reformers and the Fathers of the Church* (Inaugural Lecture, Oxford, 10 May, 1960). Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960.

Hein, Karl. "Die Sakramentslehre des Johannes a Lasco." Submitted for degree of Licentiat. Rheinischen Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität. Bonn, 1904.

Hooper, John. *Early Writings of John Hooper*. Ed. for the Parker Society by Samuel Carr. Cambridge, England: The University Press, 1843.

________. *Later Writings of Bishop Hooper*. Ed. for the Parker Society by Charles Nevinson. Cambridge, England: The University Press, 1852.

Hughes, Philip Edgcumbe. *Theology of the English Reformers*. n. p.: Hodder and Stoughton, 1965.

Muller, James Arthur. *Stephen Gardiner and the Tudor Reaction*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1926.

Parker, T. H. L., ed. *English Reformers*. Vol. XXVI of *The Library of Christian Classics*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1966.

Ridley, Jasper. *Nicholas Ridley: A Biography*. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1957.

Ridley, Nicholas. *The Works of Nicholas Ridley*. Ed for the Parker Society by Henry Christmas. Cambridge, England: The University Press, 1841.

Examinations of the Eucharist in the Reformation

Barclay, Alexander. *The Protestant Doctrine of the Lord's Supper: A Study in the Eucharistic Teaching of Luther, Zwingli and Calvin*. Glasgow: Jackson, Wylie & Co., 1927.

Bizer, Ernst, and Kreck, Walter. "Die Abendmahlslehre in den reformatorischen Bekenntnisschriften." *Theologische Existenz Heute*, N. F. 47 (1955).

Clark, Francis. *Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation*. Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1960.

Dugmore, C. W. *The Mass and the English Reformers*. London: Macmillan and Company Ltd., 1958.

________. Review of *Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation*, by Francis Clark. *Journal of Theological Studies*, N.S. Vol. XIV, Part I (April, 1963).

Grass, Hans. *Die Abendmahlslehre bei Luther und Calvin*. Band 47, *Beiträge zur Förderung Christlicher Theologie*. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1954.

Köhler, Walther. *Zwingli und Luther: Ihr Streit über das Abendmahl nach seinen politischen und religiösen Beziehungen*. Band VII, *Quellen und Forschungen zur Reformationsgeschichte*. 2 Vols. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1953.

Parker, T. M. Review of *The Mass and the English Reformers*, by C. W. Dugmore. *Journal of Theological Studies*, N.S. Vol. XII, Part I (April, 1961).

General Examinations of the Eucharist

Brilioth, Yngve. *Eucharistic Faith and Practise: Evangelical and Catholic*. Trans. A. G. Hebert. London: SPCK, 1956.

Dix, Gregory. *The Shape of the Liturgy*. 2nd ed. London: Dacre Press; A.& C. Black, 1945.

Dugmore, C. W. Review of *The Shape of the Liturgy*, by Gregory Dix. *Journal of Theological Studies*, Vol. XLVII (1946).

Freeman, E. S. *The Lord's Supper in Protestantism*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1945.

Luther

Heidler, Fritz. *Christi Gegenwart Beim Abendmahl*. 2nd. rev. ed. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, GMBH, 1949.

Heman, R. *Mysterium Sanctum Magnum*. Lucerne: Verlag Räber & Cie., 1937.

Luther, Martin. *Luther's Works*. Ed. Jaroslav Pelikan and Helmut T. Lehmann. 55 Vols. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1955-.

________. *Luther's Primary Works*. Ed. Henry Wace and C. A. Buchheim. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1896.

________. *A Treatise Concerning the Blessed Sacrament of the Holy and True Body of Christ and Concerning the Brotherhoods*. Trans. J. J. Schindel. n. p.: no publisher, n.d.

Meyer, Hans Bernhard. *Luther und Die Messe: Eine liturgiewissenschaftliche Untersuchung über das Verhältnis Luthers zum Messwesen des späten Mittelalters*. Paderborn: Verlag Bonifacius-Druckerei, 1965.

Peters, Albrecht. *Realpräsenz: Luthers Zeugnis von Christi Gegenwart im Abendmahl*. Band V, *Arbeiten Zur Geschichte und Theologie des Luthertums*. Berlin: Lutherisches Verlagshaus, 1960.

Sasse, Hermann. *This is My Body: Luther's Contention for the Real Presence in the Sacrament of the Altar*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1959.

Schempp, Paul. "Das Abendmal bei Luther." *Evangelische Theologie*, Heft 8 (September, 1935).

Orthodoxy and Nominalism

Bueschner, G. N. *The Eucharistic Teaching of William of William of Ockham*. Washington, D. C.: Catholic University Press, 1950.

Copleston, F. *A History of Philosophy*. *The Bellarmine Series* XIV. ---.8 Vols. London: Burns Oates and Washbourne, 1947-.

Damerau, Rudolph. *Die Abendmalslehre des Nominalismus insobesondere die des Gabriel Biel*. Giessen: Wilhelm Schmitz Verlag, 1963.

Deferrari, R. J. *A Lexicon of St. Thomas Aquinas*. Washington, D. C: Catholic University Press, 1948.

Oberman, H. A. *The Harvest of Medieval Theology*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1963.

Thomas Aquinas. *The Summa Theologica of St. Thomas Aquinas*. Trans. The Fathers of the English Dominican Province. 18 Vols. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1941.

William of Occam. *The De Sacramento Altaris of William of Ockham*. Trans. T. Bruce Birch. Burlington, Iowa: The Lutheran Literary Board, 1930.

Reformation

Bainton, Roland H. *The Reformation of the Sixteenth Century*. Boston: The Beacon Press, 1952.

Grimm, Harold J. *The Reformation Era*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1954.

Harbison, E. Harris. *The Age of Reformation*. Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1955.

Hillerbrand, Hans J. *The Reformation*. New York: Harper and Row, 1964.

Kidd, B. J., ed. *Documents Illustrative of the Continental Reformation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911.

Littell, Franklin H., ed. *Reformation Studies: Essays in Honor of Roland H. Bainton*. Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, 1962.

Peter Martyr Vermigli

Jenkins, C. Review of *The Visible Words of God*, by Joseph C. McLelland. *Journal of Theological Studies*, N. S. Vol. IX, Part I (April, 1958).

McLelland, Joseph C. *The Visible Words of God*. Ediburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1957.

McNair, Philip. *Peter Martyr in Italy*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967.

Vermigli, Peter-Martyr. *The Common Places of...Peter Martyr*. Trans. and gathered by Anthonie Marten. London: no publisher, 1583.

Zwingli

Rilliet, Jean. *Zwingli, Third Man of the Reformation*. Trans. Harold Knight. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964.

Zwingli, Ulrich. *Huldreich Zwinglis Sämtliche Werke*. Vol. XC in *Corpus Reformatorum*. Eds. Emil Egli, *et. al.* Leipzig: Verlag von M. Heinlus Nachfolgt, 1914.

_______. *Zwingli and Bullinger*. Vol. XXIV of *The Library of Christian Classics*. Trans. G. W. Bromiley. London: S. C. M. Press Ltd., 1953.

ABSTRACT

The dissertation is an attempt to determine the position of Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, with regard to the general Eucharistic debate in the Reformation, with specific reference to the Reformed Eucharistic doctrine on the matter of the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper. A related and significant issue is the relationship of the English Reformation to the Continental Reformation, with specific reference to the Reformed Eucharistic doctrine on the matter of the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Supper. A second issue is the question of the consistency of Cranmer's understanding of the presence of Christ as found in the Prayer Books of 1549 and 1552.

In order to clarify these matters, the Eucharistic writings of the major Continental Reformers are examined in detail. Points of similarity and dissimilarity are indicated. The English Reformers' Eucharistic teachings are also discussed. This is done first with reference to the Eucharistic debate as an whole between the conservatives on the one hand, and the liberals and radicals on the other. The works of Thomas Cranmer are then noted. The Book of Common Prayer (1549 and 1552 editions) and the apologetic writings of Cranmer relative to the service books are examined, as well as other relevant works.

As a result of these researches, it is discovered that Calvin, Bullinger, Bucer, and Peter Martyr agree in their understanding of the nature of the presence of Christ in the elements, with specific reference to the role of faith on the one hand, and the Holy Spirit on the other. Subjective and objective concepts of the presence are therefore present together. For the faithful Christ is objectively present in the elements through the action of the Holy Spirit. Further, Thomas Cranmer shares his concept of the presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper with the "Calvin-Bucer-Bullinger-Martyr" constellation, especially on the matter of the subjective-objective understanding of the presence of Christ in the elements. He agrees that the controlling factor of faith is necessary for the reception of the true body and blood of Christ. On the other hand, Calvin, Bullinger, Bucer, Martyr, and Cranmer reject transubstantiation and the concept of the _inclusio localis_, whereby Christ's body is limited to the elements, corporally enclosed there after Consecration.

It is concluded that the argument for a purely indigenous English doctrine of the Eucharist is untenable, since Cranmer shares the position of the "second generation" Reformers on the question of the presence of Christ. Further, it is possible to discern a consistent teaching of the presence of Christ in the Supper from Cranmer if the relevant statements are understood in terms of his "Calvinist" position.

Appended Notes A and B discuss the question of the transition from Orthodoxy to Nominalism, dealing in turn with Thomas and William of Occam. Cranmer's position with regard to Nominalism is then defined as that of a generally positive relationship.

Appended Note C is concerned with the difficult historical problem of the development of Cranmer's Eucharistic teaching from 1533 to 1548. It is concluded that we find a consistent teaching from Cranmer from about 1546, contrary to generally accepted judgments, if Cranmer's position is understood in its own "Calvinist" terms. The question of a Lutheran period for Cranmer is discussed. It is concluded that if "Lutheran" mean rejection of transubstantiation and acceptance of the corporal inclusion, Cranmer held three opinions of the Eucharist during his lifetime. But when it is recalled that the label "Lutheran" is the equivalent of that of "orthodox" on the question of the mode of the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the elements, on this issue Cranmer held only two opinions, as he himself insisted.